

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, if paid in advance or within the year; otherwise, \$3.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY

JAS. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D. J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.
FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D.D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D.D., LL.D. PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D.D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D.D. PROF. F. P. MANHART, D.D.
PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. 3.

JULY, 1907.

GETTYSBURG:

WILLIAM B. HAMMOND, 142 CARLISLE STREET.

1907.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLES	PAGE
I. THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL: A SUPPLEMENT, BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.	305
II. LUTHERAN GERMANY AND THE BOOK OF CONCORD, BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.	328
III. PAUL GERHARDT IN THE CHURCH TROUBLES OF HIS TIME, BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.	357
IV. BABYLONIA, GLIMPSES OF ITS CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE, BY PROFESSOR CARL JOSEF GRIMM, Ph.D.	377
V. THE AMERICAN FAMILY, BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. L. REED, M.D.	384
VI. PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN LUTHERANS AND HIGHER EDUCATION, BY REV. F. G. GOTWALD, D.D.	404
VII. THE DOCTRINE OF SIN, BY REV. W. L. RUTHERFORD, A.M.	422
VIII. PHILOSOPHICAL INFLUENCES IN HIGHER CRITI- CISM; BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT, A.M.	433
X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE,	289

The Ideas that have Influenced Civilization—Entwürfe zu Katechesen über Luther's Kleinen Katechismus—What Think Ye of Christ?—Between the Testaments—A Church History for the Use of Schools and Colleges—The Atlantic Monthly—God's Missionary plan for the World—The Psychology of Religious Belief—Light on the Old Testament from Babel.

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1907.

ARTICLE I.

THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL:
A SUPPLEMENT.

(CONCLUDED FROM P. 225.)

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

VII. THE THREE CAUSES.

Having in the first part of our discussion shown the meaning of Article XVIII. of the Augsburg Confession, we proceed to exhibit the fuller realization of *The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will*.

If we recur to the Article itself we find that it declares that the ability to work spiritual righteousness "is wrought by the the Holy Spirit, who is given through the word of God"; or as it is presented in the Latin: "This is effected in hearts when through the word the Holy Spirit is conceived." The conception is that the Will is made active, that is, is potentiated by the Holy Spirit, who uses the Word as the instrument of his energy. "When grace precedes, the Will follows." With Augustine we may call this *assent*, or with the Council of Orange we may call it *consent* or *cōoperation*. In the divinely potentiated Will there is an activity, a doing, and this activity, this doing, extends beyond hearing and reflecting on the Word preached and heard. It involves a cessation of resistance, a choice, an acceptance of the grace, assistance, operation. Any other conception takes from conversion, and from the doing of spiritual righteousness, all ethical significance, and utterly vacates the ethical personality of man, for it is man who is converted, or rather, *converts*, that is, becomes changed in

character, and works spiritual righteousness. It is not the Spirit who is converted, or who does spiritual righteousness; it is the man. The three causes, as Melanchthon subsequently more fully explained, are here present: The Word, the Spirit, and the human Will not wholly inactive. The activity of the subject is always implied when we use the words grace, assistance. We assist an invalid into or out of bed, but the invalid's Will is in some sense active. We place a stone in the wall. We lead an ox to the slaughter. The conceptions are entirely different, because the subjects of our action are different, and we suit the conception and the word to the subject.

Hence there is no escaping the conclusion that in some sense man is an *active* concurrent in conversion, in conceiving faith, in doing spiritual righteousness, unless we are prepared to say that he is a stone, a beast, has no Free-will, is only *subjectum convertendum*, and we know that no such conceptions of man were entertained by Melanchthon when the Confession was written, and we know that no such conceptions of man had ever been enunciated by standard teachers of the Church, much less endorsed by the Church herself. The Word and the Holy Spirit precede—the one inherently active, and the other very activity, life itself. When the Spirit through the Word begins to illumine the understanding and to correct the Will, the Free-will, the man, is passive in that he receives an impression. But the correlate to passion, not separated in time, but in the order of cause and effect, is *action*. The two are so related that in noting the former we are bound to connote the latter, that is, to include the two in a common concept, just as we do in the case of parent and child. The Will is *causa concurrens*. There is not one word in the eighteenth Article nor in the corresponding Article in the Apology to justify any other conclusion. The subsequent treatment of the subject by Melanchthon does not exhibit any change of view, but only fuller and more formal statement of that which exists in the essential qualities and causes already named, the Word, the Holy Spirit and the Will. But in such teaching there is not, and there never was intended to be, a single intimation of Pelagianism or of Semi-pelagianism. And in all that Melanchthon wrote on Free-will

—and we affirm this as a challenge—he never attributed anything *meritorious* to the Will's activity in conceiving faith, or in doing "spiritual righteousness"; and nowhere does he teach that the Will takes the *initiative* in performing what he calls "a good action," nor does he intimate that it is *causa efficiens*, nor does he even use the word coöperate, nor does he ever intimate that the Will acts only by its own powers in conceiving faith or in doing "spiritual righteousness," or in "performing a good action," and should anyone contradict these propositions he does so absolutely without warrant. But for proof of our propositions we point to the damnatory paragraph of the eighteenth Article, which first appeared in the *editio princeps*: "They condemn the Pelagians and others who teach that without the Holy Spirit, solely by the powers of nature [these words had appeared already in the *Excursus* to the Scholia on *Colossians*] we are able to love God above all things," and to the declaration in the last edition of the *Loci* (1559) in which he says: "The human Will without the assistance of the Holy Spirit is not able to perform spiritual works." That is, from the day on which Melanchthon wrote the Augsburg Confession he never changed his doctrine of Free-will. In his later writings, both private and official, he only expanded, systematized and expounded what he had stated in simpler form in the Confession. In the Confession, in the *Loci* and in the Reply to the Bavarian Articles we have the same three concurrents, namely, the the Word, Holy Spirit and the Will. In the Latin edition of the Confession published in September, 1531, known as *editio octavae formae*, he did not change one word in Article XVIII. In the German edition printed at the close of the year 1532, known as the German *Variata* of 1533, and prepared, Weber thinks, in 1531, but more likely in the second half of 1532, there is not the change of a single word in Article XVIII., except that in the antithesis, instead of "nicht thun," we have "one den heiligen Geist nicht thun," which adjusts the antithesis to the thesis. In the German *Variatae* (two editions) of 1540, Article XVIII. is printed word for word as it had been printed in the *Variata* of 1533, notwithstanding the fact that in the *Loci* of 1535 the author had more fully and more clearly expressed

the doctrine of the three concurring causes, and had given a slight expansion to the doctrine of Free-will in the Latin, *Variata* of 1540, which is supposed to have been prepared in the year 1535, and which, he publicly and officially declared, does not differ in meaning from the Confession as it had been previously known to exist; to all of which must be added the fact that to the latest day of his life he confessed himself, without making distinction of editions, to the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and to its Apology.

There is also another fact: There does not exist a single line of evidence to show that anyone (not even Luther himself) ever challenged the *Loci* of 1535, or that of 1543-44 or intimated the existence of discrepancy between the teaching of the Confession and that of the *Loci* on the subject of Free-will, until, led by political animosity, the Weimar princes had determined to erect the Jena Academy into a university in theological antagonism to Leipzig and Wittenberg, and had called to their aid such personal enemies of Melanchthon as Nicholas von Amsdorf * and Matthias Flacius Illyricus, the former of whom had lost his bishopric of Naumburg, and the latter, so Melanchthon charges, had left Wittenberg because he had not been appointed to succeed a certain deceased professor.

Now this is the conclusion to which we are brought by the facts in the case: Beginning with the *Excursus*, August, 1527, we henceforth find no trace of predestinarian determinism in anything that has come down to us from the pen of Melanchthon. In the Confession and in the Apology he brings together the three concurring causes of a good action. In the *Loci* of subsequent periods he simply expounds, illustrates and applies the proposition which he had laid down in the Confession and had amplified in the Apology.

But this conclusion is based on internal evidence—on what Melanchthon himself has said and written. It may be invalidated by the supposition that Melanchthon was insincere when he declares, to the end his life, that the Confession and the Apology express his faith; or by the exhibition of some contradicting

* See *Das Erste Jahrzehnd der Universität Jena*. By Schwartz, pp 43, 61.

passages from his writings ; or by the testimony of the pupils who, generation after generation, sat at his feet from the year 1530 to the close of his life. As for the first supposition, let him defend it who has a mind to do so ; as for the second, we make bold to say, after having read on the subject all that has come down to us from the pen of Melanchthon, that no passages can be found that contradict or even seem to contradict the Confession and the Apology *de libero arbitrio*, not even the famous *liberum arbitrium in homine est facultas applicandi*, etc., when explained and applied as Melanchthon declared that it should be ; * and as for the third supposition, we have that in official form.

It speaks for itself :

VIII. THE TESTIMONY OF MELANCHTHON'S PUPILS.

Here we have information which, we think, will be entirely new to the readers of the THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. It is taken from several *opinions* rendered by the theologians of the churches of Pomerania. The first is dated at Old Stettin, May 12th, 1578, and was called forth by the Bergic Book, which had been sent to the churches for their signatures. The theologians point out numerous changes that had been made in transforming the Torgau Book into the Bergic Book, and give reasons why they cannot subscribe the latter, which they call "the revised Formula Concordiae." Especially do they condemn the *status controversiae* in regard to Free-will. They declare that some of them had been students at Wittenberg during the lifetime of Luther and Melanchthon, and that for years they had heard them lecture on and discuss the article of Free-will. They then testify as follows : "The *Opinion* of the co-operation of man's Free-will in spiritual things by its own natural powers, which Illyricus (Flacius) and his followers have, in a way that causes distrust, charged against Melanchthon's *Loci* and against the passage from Chrysostom : God draws, but draws him who is willing ; and the passage from Melanchthon : In the struggle of conversion the human Will is not absolutely inactive, and which *Opinion* is now presented

* See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for 1905, pp. 325 *et seqq.*

in the revised Book of Concord, which has been laid before us for subscription—of such *Opinion* we never heard or saw a trace during the lifetime of Luther. On the contrary, we heard and were taught, and by God's grace have taught others, that in conversion to God man's Free-will by its own powers can do and does do nothing, and can contribute nothing of itself or by itself to his conversion. But also that in conversion to God man is not absolutely like a block or a stone. But when through the instrumentality of the Word of God he is moved and drawn by the Holy Spirit, he then, as a rational being, has a movement in himself. By carnal wickedness he can oppose God. Or by the grace of the Holy Spirit, without whose grace man can do nothing by his natural powers, he can by using his Will submit to God and his Word, and can become obedient to the same, though there is still much weakness in the flesh." They then affirm that already during the years 1531–1534 Melanchthon had taught on the article of Free-will exactly as he taught in the *Loci* of 1535, viz : "In lucta spirituali videamus conjungi has causas, verbum Dei, Spiritum Sanctum et voluntatem hominis non sane otiosam, sed repugnantem infirmitati."

They say further that the identical doctrine taught by Melanchthon in the *Loci* of 1542–4, had been taught them orally by Melanchthon, and that such doctrine, not only had not been rejected by Luther, but had been approved by him in his discussion of the passage in Paul: *Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri*, and in the Preface to the first Latin volume of his works.

They also say that nowhere in the *Loci*, whether in the earliest, or in the later or in the latest editions, "is it taught that man by his own natural powers in this corrupt nature can in any sense obey God, or believe the Word or approve it unto his salvation, or by his own powers prepare himself or fit himself for conversion. But on the contrary we have always read and found in the said books that he steadfastly with great earnestness and zeal taught in opposition to Pelagians and Papists that man's Will without the grace of the Holy Spirit, by his own natural powers, can do nothing and can understand

nothing in divine matters, *neque volendo, neque inchoando, neque efficiendo.* * * * Melanchthon always laid down the fundamental principle: The Will without the Holy Spirit is not able to will, to begin or to effect the spiritual conduct which God requires." They then refer to the fact that in the *Confessio Saxonica* (1551) Melanchthon had declared that "in conversion the Will of man, when the Holy Spirit has been accepted, is not inactive," and that in *The Reply to the Bavarian Articles*, he had said: "The human Will, in so far as it has begun to be healed, is the follower of the Holy Spirit." *

The Pomeranian theologians in Synod assembled, August 5th, 1581, declare: "We never approved Synergism in the sense that the powers of the flesh begin or effect conversion. Nor are we now able to find that Melanchthon in the *Loci* of 1543 and 1545, published while Luther was yet living, taught or approved it as has been charged by Flacius and his followers. Nor does that paragraph which was inserted in the *Loci* shortly after Luther's death against the Manichaeans and the Enthusiasts, or on account of the Epicureans, or in the interest of anxious consciences in our Church, confirm that Synergism in regard to the powers of the flesh without the Holy Spirit, (if pious candor be used). Hence we beseech V. R. to consider whether, against our conscience, and in the face of known truth we can approve those horrid clamors, those malignant, false columnies, and accusations, which with the utmost virulence have been circulated against Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*." They then say that they cannot approve it that the proposition: "The Will of man in conversion is not inactive like a block, but does something, be categorically rejected and condemned, as has been done in the Form of Concord without explanation, whereas in the first Torgau Book, which in the year 1576 had been sent to the churches, it had been piously and properly explained." And further: "We know also that the authors of the Book were piously and faithfully warned by the theologians in the Church, and in the University of

* These quotations have been made from Balthaser's *Andere Sammlung zur Pommerschen Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 116 et seqq. Original Documents.

Rostock, before the unfortunate publication of the Book, that they should not reject the union of the three causes in conversion, but should retain them and explain them piously and properly." *

Of the Augsburg Confession of 1540 the Synod of Stettin in 1578 said: "Luther himself for more than six years before his death had seen this more fully explained changed edition, which in the year 1540 and subsequently was used at the councils. Had he scented in it such corruption, and seductive, sacramentarian, antinomian, papistical or Pelagian teaching, he would not have kept silent on the subject." †

And as proof that these Pomeranian churches were not Calvinistically inclined, we have the declaration of the Stettin General Synod of March 7th, 1577, that they (the theologians) accept the Articles on the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ and the Descensus ad Inferos as they had been set forth in the Torgau Book; also the Article on Predestination, that on Original Sin, and that on Free-will with the understanding that Melanchthon's doctrine of Free-will is in fundamental agreement with that of Luther on the same subject. But when that Book was transformed into the Bergic Book and had been Flacianized, they refused to accept it, and raised serious objections to the changes that had been introduced into it in favor of the Flacianist extremes.

Also Jacob Rung, Superintendent of Wolgast, declared: "The authors of the Concordia did indeed aim to remove Calvinism, but in the effort they very artfully established and smuggled in Flacianism." ‡ And that this allegation about Flacianism is true we showed from official sources in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October 1905, pp. 490-4, and that the Flacianists themselves so understood it is shown by the fact that in their subscription to the Formula of Concord, January 12th, 1579, the Prussians, led by Hesshus and Wigand, the most uncompromising of Flacianists, declared that they find

* Balthasar, *Andere Sammlung*, pp. 231 *et seqq.*

† Minutes in Balthasar's *Erste Sammlung*, pp. 325 *et seqq.* signed *inter alios* by John Cogler, Superintendent of Stettin, and by Jacob Rung, Superintendent of Wolgast.

‡ Balthasar, *Andere Sammlung*, p. 254.

"the corrected copy [that is, the Bergic Book] in harmony with the Word of God;" and further do they declare that only this and no other exemplar of the Formula would they subscribe.* That is, they subscribed after the revisers of the Torgau Book had introduced into the Article on Free-will the things demanded by the *Prussian Opinion*, which had been sent in the preceding year.†

Here now in these official documents, quoted above, we have information in regard to the teaching of Melanchthon, and indeed also of Lüther, on Free-will, which carries us right back to the year 1531, the year in which the Augsburg Confession and the Apology were published in Latin and in German and later in the same year published again in Latin, absolutely without any change of Article XVIII. These competent theologians, pupils of Melanchthon, testify that in that year, Melanchthon taught the very same identical doctrine on Free-will and on the three causes that he published in the *Loci* of 1535. The chain is absolutely complete. The testimony shows how Melanchthon understood and interpreted Article XVIII. in the Confession and in the Apology, and why it was that to the end of his days on earth he could appeal to both as exhibiting his faith. According to these witnesses Melanchthon never taught, as the Flacianists alleged, that man by his natural powers can turn himself to God and can work spiritual righteousness. Also: He did not teach that in conversion to God man is like a block or a stone, or is *absolutely passive*. He put no such interpretation on the Article in question, for we must emphasize, by repetition, that the *editio octavae formae* was prepared in 1531 and the second German edition was printed in 1532 both unchanged absolutely in Article XVIII., except as noted above, p. (307), while also in 1531 he wrote to Brentz that "predestination follows our faith and works,"‡ and in his commentary on Romans, 1532, he distinctly declares that "in conceiving faith there is a struggle in us," and that in election

* Heppe, *Geschichte des Deutschen Protestantismus*, III., 260, and Herzog 2, XVII., p. 110.

† See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Oct. 1905, pp. 490-4.

‡ C. R. II. p. 547.

"there is some cause in the accipient in that he does not reject the promise extended." "All the old writers, except Augustine, place some cause of election in us." "But neither can the promise of mercy be accepted, nor can confidence be conceived except as the Holy Spirit by the Word moves hearts, as is said: *No one comes unto me except the Father draw him.* Moreover, let the Will do all that it can, it must never be thought that salvation depends upon the measure or value of our action, but upon the promise, so that justification be not separated from trust in mercy."*

Such is the *status controversiae* as regards Melanchthon. The facts and the testimony can be resisted only by a will hardened in its determination to believe and to reiterate and to perpetuate the Flacianist calumnies, and to be more Lutheran than Luther himself, for it is demonstrably certain that Luther not only did not reject or find fault with the *Loci*, but lauded and commended the edition of 1535 and that of 1543-4 almost above measure, though we cannot see why Luther should be *norma normans* for the correct interpretation of the Scriptures and for doctrine, and Melanchthon only *norma normata*. The former was a great religious genius; the latter the more learned theologian and the better logician. They differed from each other, but they did not disagree. A few disappointed and infuriated admirers of Luther, by canonizing views expressed in the *De Servo Arbitrio* which Luther had let fall into the back-ground, succeeded in setting the one in array against the other after that both had become forever united in the bosom of their common Lord and Master. *Pro Pudor!*

IX. THE SYNERGISTS.

Conrad Schlusselburg, a rabid Flacianist, in describing "the sect of the Synergists," names Melanchthon as "the author of this sect." He was followed by George Major, John Pfeffinger, Paul Eber, Victorine Strigel and Paul Crell. "Also the anti-

*This Commentary on Romans does not appear in the *Corpus Reformationis*. It was prepared early in the year 1532, and consequently joins on immediately to the teaching of 1531, and is contemporaneous with the second published editions of the Confession and Apology. Galle, p. 291-4.

Lutheran Wittenbergers, degenerate disciples of Luther, in many accursed books, undertook to defend the *synergia* of the carnal Will in spiritual things.*

Having before us the most important of the writings of these men *de libero arbitrio*, we are enabled to show exactly what they taught on this subject. We begin with Pfeffinger, inasmuch as we have disposed of Melanchthon.

1. In the year 1555 John Pfeffinger, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig, published a small book entitled: *De Libertate Voluntatis Humanae. Quaestiones Quinque.* In the first question he asks whether there is liberty in the human Will to perform external righteousness, such as to abstain from murder, theft and the like crimes. He answers the question in the affirmative. He then says: "When it is asked whether and to what extent the Will is able to obey the law of God, let it be replied truly and without qualification that human nature is not able to satisfy the law of God because of the depravity born in us, since the law of God requires not only external obedience, but also internal cleanness and purity of heart, and complete and perfect obedience.

"It is certain that men do not have the freedom to get rid of this depravity that is born with us, just as they do not have the power to get rid of death." To substantiate this proposition he appeals to Romans 8th, and to the words of Christ: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind." He then continues: "When inquiry is made about spiritual actions, it is rightly answered that the human Will does not have such liberty as to be able to perform spiritual deeds without the assistance of the Holy Spirit." [The very language of the Augsburg Confession.]

"We must not resist the Holy Spirit when he moves our minds, but we must assent to him. For in this way the Holy Spirit is accepted by those who seek, that is, by those who do not spurn, do not resist, but with groaning seek assistance. In Acts it is said: He gave the Holy Spirit to them who obey him."

Then while on the one hand he declares that the virtues

* *Catalogi Haereticorum, Liber Quintus*, pp. 13-16.

which agree with the law of God cannot be performed without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he affirms on the other hand : " Nevertheless the Will is not inactive, nor is it like a statue, but three acting causes concur, the Holy Spirit, who operates through the Word of God, the mind thinking, the Will not resisting, but in some sense obeying the Holy Spirit now operating, and by earnestly seeking the assistance of God, as is said in Mark 9th : Lord, I believe.

" Hence some assent or apprehension on our part must concur, when now the Holy Spirit shall have illumined the mind, the Will, the heart. Hence Basil says: Only will, and God anticipates. And Chrysostom: He draws, but he draws him who is willing. And St. Augustine says: He assists those who receive the gift of the call with becoming piety, and, as far as in man lies, conserve the gift of God. And again: When grace precedes, the Will follows."

Then Pfeffinger denies that the Will is like a stone, a statue, and declares that it is not inactive. " If the Will were inactive there would be no difference between the pious and the impious, or between the elect and the damned, between a Saul and a David, between a Judas and a Paul."

" Some persons vociferate that the assistance of the Holy Spirit is weakened and diminished if even the least bit be attributed to the human will. Though this argument may appear specious and plausible, yet pious minds know that by this our doctrine, according to which we allow some *synergia* to our Will, that is, some assent, some apprehension, absolutely nothing is taken away from the assistance of the Holy Spirit. We affirm that the first parts must be given and attributed to him, since he first and primarily through the Word or the voice of the Gospel moves hearts to believe, to whom we ought to assent, as far as in us lies, and we ought not to resist the Holy Spirit, but we ought to submit to the Word, as Christ says: Whosoever hath heard of the Father, and learned cometh to me etc. Nor does our doctrine contain anything opposed to the words of Paul: Faith is the gift of God. For we are justified not on account of our quality or worthiness, but for the sake of the merit of Christ, which we lay hold on by faith,

which faith or confidence the Spirit kindles in us when we do not resist, but consent and try to obey."

We thus see that Pfeffinger teaches in full harmony with Melanchthon, to whose *Loci* he directs those who desire further information on the subject. That is, Pfeffinger attributes no *causa efficiens*, no *causa meritoria*, to the action of the human Will in attaining salvation; nor is it said, nor even intimated, that man by his own natural powers assents to the Word of God, but only does he have the power to assent when he is moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit. And in no sense does Pfeffinger attribute the *initiative* to the human Will, nor does he even once use the word *cōperate*. Justification is for the sake of Christ, whose merit is seized by faith, which is the gift of God.

Pfeffinger also teaches, in harmony with Melanchthon, that "the promise of grace is universal," that "all the saved are chosen for the sake of Christ," that "the cause of election and of justification is the same," namely, "the mercy of God reconciled by Christ, who was made an offering and a propitiation for the sins of the human race."

It will be seen that in this teaching there is not a word that justifies the allegation that Pfeffinger taught that man by his own natural powers can prepare himself for the gift of the Holy Spirit, or that by his own natural powers he can work spiritual righteousness. But now at the beginning of 1558, when the Jena Academy was about to be erected into a University in the interest of a reactionary Lutheranism, Nicholas von Amsdorf, a rigid determinist and a holder of the doctrine of particularistic election, sent forth his *Public Confession of the Pure Doctrine of the Gospel and Confutation of the Fanatics of the Present Time.**

In this Confession, which we have read from the beginning to the end, the author confesses his firm adherence to the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles, and condemns the Schwenkfeldians, the Osiandrians, the Sacramentarians, the Adiaphorists and the proposition that good works are necessary to salvation, saying finally: "In addition

* Printed in Jena by Thomas Rebart.

to these five there are yet some articles as those of Dr Pfeffinger and his faction who teach and contend that man by the natural powers of his Free-will can fit and prepare himself for grace so that the Holy Spirit shall be given to him, just as the Sophists, Thomas, Scotus and others have taught. For in his Disputations on Free-Will, which he delivered two years ago, he concluded such absolutely shameless and absurd teaching with about the following words: Man by his natural powers is able to assent to the Word, to embrace the promise and cease resistance to the Holy Spirit. Therefore we must not resist the Spirit, but we must assent to him when he moves our minds and hearts. For in this way the Holy Spirit is given to those who do not spurn nor resist him. "Haec ille, si recte memini."

Then after interpreting and refuting these alleged words from Pfeffinger, he says: "Such sophistry should be consigned to the Devil, and pious Christians should not be hounded by it."

Pfeffinger promptly replied in a small book bearing the title : *Refutatio Manifesti Mendacii.* He republished his *Quaestiones Quinque* without the change of a word, and denounces Amsdorf's method of quotation as "an atrocious accusation and a capital crime : "Haec ille, si recte memini, because by a word he would cut the throat of a brother for whom Christ died." He not only repudiates Amsdorf's false quotation, but repudiates the doctrine which had been attributed to himself. He not only states in the most positive manner that because of innate sin human nature cannot satisfy the law of God, but also : "In regard to spiritual things man is not so free or so strong of himself that he can of himself awaken or excite a truly spiritual thought or inclination to spiritual deeds, to say nothing about perfecting or completing the same. But the Holy Spirit must precede us in everything ; must awaken and excite the heart, mind and spirit to good works, which is properly laying the first stone. But when the Holy Spirit does this, then we must not resist him, but must obey, and must call upon God, and pray that he will give us his Holy Spirit which then indeed is done, as it is written : Acts 5 : God has given the Holy Spirit to them that obey Him." And again : "The Holy Spirit precedes the Will of man and excites

it. The Will of man must not resist the Holy Spirit, but must follow him, and in his weakness he must call upon God for grace and assistance that he may be redeemed and saved." He closes by declaring that his doctrine is in harmony with the Apostles,' the Nicene, the Athanasian, Creeds, and with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles. Thus his reply contains not only a denial of Amsdorf's allegations, but a complete refutation of Amsdorf's *manifestum mendacium*.

But the *pseudos proton* was now launched, and it has gone on its mission of defamation and schism to this day. The words *synergism* and *synergists* were applied, as terms of reproach and of heretical discrimination, to all who refused to adopt Luther's fundamental predicates in regard to Free-will as contained in the *De Servo Arbitrio*, viz., that Free-will is a nonentity, and that man is like a block, a stone, and is absolutely passive in conversion; and in the face of denials and protests to the contrary the Flacianists continued to misquote, to garble, and to misinterpret the writings of all who asserted that in conversion there is some activity of our Will. They charged in particular that the "Synergists" taught that there are three efficient causes in conversion, and that man can assent and coöperate by his own natural powers, and by his own natural powers can prepare himself for the grace of God. This was done by Flacius again and again in the Weimar Colloquy in 1560, notwithstanding the fact that Strigel in the fundamental propositions which he had laid down before the Colloquy began, had again and again declared that man by his natural powers, without the Son of God, without the gift of the Holy Spirit, is not able to begin the work of a true and saving conversion to God, and the "Will cannot assent to the Gospel, except God assist, sanctify, illumine and vivify."* But all protests and denials were unavailing, and the defamation and columniation and persecution went on.

2. That Strigel was not a Synergist in any such sense as was charged is shown conclusively by his *Declaration*, made in

* *Disputatio Vinariensis*, edidit Musaeus, 1562, pp. 2, 3.

1563, which was pronounced orthodox by Jacob Andreae and others who bore the same of being true Lutherans.*

The falseness of the Flacianist allegations against Strigel is also demonstrated in his private writings. For instance in an essay (dated 1564), handed down to us in Schlusselburg, we read as follows: "In true conversion to God it is necessary that the mind be illumined by the Son of God through the Gospel and that the will be effectively drawn by the Holy Spirit. When this is done the mind assents to the promise of grace, not by its own powers, but by the agency of the Holy Spirit, who in this mode through reflection on the Word, and not otherwise, is effective. Of such a declaration there are many clear testimonies in the discourses of Christ and of Paul." Then after making numerous quotations from Christ and Paul, he proceeds as follows: "But though the Holy Spirit kindles this faith, as I have said, by reflection on the Word, yet he is not efficacious in man, as if he were a block which does nothing. But he so draws and converts man that in adults who know some doctrine he means that there is some action of the Will which may accompany his own activity. Hence we must know that faith is the gift and work of God, but it is bestowed on those who are called and who assent, that is, who hear the Word of God, and reflect on it and embrace it by assent, resist doubt and in this struggle seek assistance from God. These things are to be learned in daily prayer, in which conversion either is effected or increases. But by no means are those to be heard who imagine that man in conversion not only defiantly resists the Holy Spirit, but even rages against God."†

These views are supported by the author with many quotations from the Greek and Latin Fathers. He repudiates both Manichaeism and Pelagianism, and nowhere does he exhibit a single trace of a conception that man can perform spiritual righteousness, or can prepare himself for conversion, or can consent to the Word of God, by his own natural powers. And we find the same identical teaching in his *Loci Communes*, published, after his death, in the years 1582 and 1583.

* *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* for 1905, pp. 456-7.

† *Catalogi Haereticorum*, V. p. 69.

3. "The anti-Lutheran Wittenbergers." In the year 1561 these "degenerate disciples of Luther" published a *Confession and Opinion on Free-will*. They reject the conception that man is like a block and is converted while resisting, but they say that "when man consents, he does not do this by the power and worthiness of his own Will, but by the efficacious operation of God (*efficacia Dei*) who in this mode operates through the Word and the voice of the Gospel and not otherwise." *

Referring to the accusation of Flacius and his colleagues that Melanchthon in his *Loci Communes* teaches that "man by the power of Free-will applies himself to grace," they say: "That is impudens mendacium, for the passage has not up to this time been shown."

In the year 1570 these same "degenerate disciples of Luther" issued a manifesto entitled *A Summary of the Confession of the University of Wittenberg*. It is signed *inter alios* by Nicholas Selneccer, who subsequently performed a most conspicuous part in the composition of the Formula of Concord. Under the subject *Of Conversion*, Propositions XCVII., XCVIII., they say: "The entire work of conversion is the beneficent action of God alone, as the Prophet cries out: Convert me and I shall be converted, because thou art my Lord God, for after thou hast converted me I will repent etc. But God has established this order, in order that conversion may be effected in us. God by the Word draws and moves the Will, so that it may not oppose nor expect compulsion, but may follow the Holy Spirit who draws it, as is said in Romans 8th. For so long as the Will altogether resists the Word of God who draws, no conversion takes place. Therefore our churches have always taught that conversion takes place according to the declarations of the ancients: When grace precedes, the Will follows; also: God draws, but he draws him who is willing; and Nazianzen has very modestly said: All strength is alone in God, but it is given to those who are called and who assent."

Then they condemn the Manichaeans and the Pelagians,

* Schlusselburg, *ut supra*, p. 529.

and "execrate the madness of the Sckwenfeldians and of the Anabaptists, who contend that God communicates himself to men without the ministry or without reflection on doctrine. But on the contrary in conversion these three always concur: the Word of God, the Holy Spirit and the Will of man assenting to and not resisting the Word of God." They also say as against the Flacianists: "But in the common exercises of the call, of faith, of invocation, of obedience toward God, the human Will, in so far as it has begun to be healed, follows the Holy Spirit who operates through the Word, and when it is assisted by the Holy Spirit it is not like a block or a stone."

So much for this book. In its several hundred pages there is not to be found a single sentence that justifies the allegation of the Flacianists that the Wittenberg theologians taught that man by his natural powers of Free-will can apply himself to grace, or can come to conversion; nor is there one word to show that they regarded the Will of man as *causa efficiens* or *causa meritoria* in attaining faith, conversion, salvation. On the contrary, nowhere in all Lutheran theological literature is the doctrine of justification by faith alone set forth with greater clearness, and with more frequent use of the *particulae exclusivae*, and of the *Propter Christum*, than is done in this *Summary*. The teaching is exactly that of Melanchthon as set forth in the *Loci Communes*, 1535, 1543-1559, viz., that when the Will is drawn by God through the instrumentality of the Word, and is assisted by the Holy Spirit, it is not entirely inactive, but assents to the Word and does not resist.

But the many protests and explanations made by the "Syn-⁴ ergists" availed nothing with the Flacianists. They went on with their calumnies and accusations. At the Altenburg Colloquy (1568-9) the Ducal theologians (Jena-Weimar) still accuse the Electoral theologians (Leipzig-Wittenberg) with teaching that "the natural man as regards his natural powers is able in his conversion and regeneration to attend to, to understand, to apprehend the things of God"; "that corrupt man by his natural powers is able not only to attend to the Word, but also to understand it"; "that man by doing what is

in himself is able to prepare himself for the grace of God"; that "Free-will is the power of self-application to grace."*

The method of these Ducal theologians is to garble the statements of their opponents by tearing sentences away from their connection. Then they make comments that are in no sense justified either by the text or by the context, and in places they do not distinguish their own comments from the quotations, so that the reader may know which is quotation and which is comment. In a word their method of representing their opponents is perverse in the extreme; and, which is equally perverse, they declare that their own views, which are absolutely deterministic, and are avowedly based on Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*† and other of his writings, are in full harmony with the views of the Church Fathers, and with the Augsburg Confession and the Apology.

But the claim which they make in regard to the Fathers, the Confession and the Apology, is utterly without foundation. The Fathers never taught, as these Ducal theologians do, that man in conversion is absolutely passive, is like a block, like a stone, is a pillar of salt, as was lot's wife; and we have shown that no such conceptions can be found in the Confession and in the Apology. Melanchthon's position in regard to the doctrine of Free-will at the time he wrote these celebrated pieces, and the purpose for which he wrote them and the declarations in the former—"nothing new," "differs in nothing from the Catholic Church" etc—render such a supposition not only gratuitous, but inconceivable. Melanchthon could not then have written a doctrine of Free-will which he had completely abandoned at least three years before, and which he knew, and impliedly declares, was not taught by the Fathers, and which we know was not taught by the Fathers. Hence we can no more make the *pure passive-lapis-truncus-subjectum patiens* doctrine of Free-will (whether found in the writings of the Flacianists or in the Formula of Concord, which in Article II. is essentially Flacianistic) harmonize with the eighteenth Arti-

* See *Colloquium Altenburgense*, Printed at Jena, 1570, Art. *De Libero Arbitrio*.

† *Colloquium Altenburgense*, Jena, p. 548. See also THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Oct. 1905, p.

cle of the Augsburg Confession and with the amplification of the same in the Apology, and with the Fathers, historically, theologically and practically, than we can make the Russian Bureaucracy harmonize historically, politically and practically with the Constitution of the United States. The conceptions in regard to Free-will in the one case are fundamentally different from what they are in the other. The elements are so diverse that they have no elective affinity. The only union of which they are capable is mechanical, not organic. The *pure passive* theory does not grow logically out of the simple didactic affirmation found in the Confession. Moreover, the holding of such a theory of Free-will places the holder thereof out of harmony with the Catholic Church of Christ, for no such doctrine has even been sanctioned by the Catholic Church of Christ.

To the accusations of the Ducal theologians the electoral theologians (chiefly those of the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg) made reply in 1570: "If the question be raised as to whether man by his natural powers can remove death and innate evil inclination from this corrupt nature, and can merit the forgiveness of sins, or become acceptable to God; also whether man by his own powers can convert himself to God, and can begin internal obedience in the heart without the operation of the Son of God and of the Holy Spirit, without the knowledge and acceptance of the Gospel, this is unqualifiedly evident: No man can of himself, or by his own powers, remove death and the innate evil inclination and corruption of this nature. On the contrary this is effected alone by the Son of God, who says: O death, I will be thy death. And in this there is no operation of our own power, for we are not able by our natural powers to become well pleasing to God, nor to merit the forgiveness of sins, for it stands written in Titus 2: Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by his mercy hath he saved us.

"Moreover this also is true, namely, that we neither can nor are able to satisfy the law of God, neither can we begin internal obedience in the heart, without the working of God, without the Son of God, without the knowledge of the Gospel and without the Holy Spirit."*

* *Endlicher Bericht*, Wittenberg, 1570, pp. 70, et seqq.

These theologians reject Pelagianism with vehemence, and declare "that man is not a block, a stone, but he should hear and not despise the Word of God, nor resist it, nor put from him the assistance and operation of God."

They also declare that what they teach is in accordance with the Augsburg Confession as they had heard it explained from the year 1530, and with the Apology and with the Scriptures and with the Fathers.

So now the parties stood in the year 1570. Twelve years of bitter controversy had not brought them closer together. The one party maintained that the Arbitrium is in no sense free, but is immutably the captive and slave of evil; that man is like a block, a stone, a pillar of salt, as Lot's wife, that he is absolutely passive in conversion, and charged the other party with teaching that there are three efficient causes in conversion and that man by his own natural powers can apply himself to grace. The other party denied the allegations made about their teaching, rejected the doctrine of pure passivity, and maintained that under the influence and activity of grace and by assistance of the Son of God and of the Holy Spirit, man can assent to the Word of God and can cease to resist. Both parties claimed that their respective teaching agreed with the Augsburg Confession, and with the Apology and with the ancient Fathers of the Church. Both could not be right, since the teaching of one party was not only antagonistic to that of the other, but even contradictory to that of the other. The fundamental conceptions and premises of the one contradicted those of the other. The Flacianists based their doctrine on the premises, that in regard to spiritual things man is absolutely dead, is utterly corrupt, that Free-will is a nonentity, that salvation is intended only for certain individuals (particularistic election). The so-called Synergists maintained that man is not, in regard to spiritual things, absolutely dead, but is dreadfully wounded, lacerated, and depotentiated by sin, that the promise of salvation appertains to all men (*promissio universalis*), that Free-will as the faculty of knowing and choosing exists in all men.

Of these two series of premises, which one harmonizes with

the Scriptures the reader is left to judge for himself. But we are absolutely certain that no foundation for the Flacianist premises can be found in the Augsburg Confession, nor in the Apology, nor in the Fathers, if we except Augustine in the matter of election, whose views on this point were not sanctioned by the Catholic Church, and have not been sanctioned by the Lutheran Church as such, though in the judgment of most competent scholars and theologians they have been instaurated and for a quarter of a century or more have been defended by the theologians of the Missouri Lutheran Church, who, in their discussions on Free-will, Conversion and Regeneration, and in their methods, have shown themselves to be the *manipulares* of the Flacianists. Not only have they restored the controversial use of the fundamental predicates of the Flacianists *de libero arbitrio* but they charge that their opponents teach that man by his own natural powers can coöperate with grace in conversion to God, and in effecting spiritual righteousness.*

The authors of the Formula of Concord must be placed in the same category. Contrary to their own antecedents, as we

* The opponents of Missouri emphatically declare that "the Verhalten (demeanor, behaviour, (line of) conduct; attitude, way of acting) of man is not *causa efficiens* or *causa meritoria*." "Conversion is always conceived as a process." "The Scripture always says: Man shall turn himself (Der Mensch soll sich bekehren); not that God does it. Man is to understand, is to lay hold by faith. Immediately that God comes with his Word there arises a *Verhalten*. * * * In the process of conversion there is a certain synergism, but not of an anti-scriptural character." "When God treats with us according to his order, then man is responsible, for God makes this order. But man retains the freedom of the Will." "The physician gives medicine to the sick. We teach *auxilium gratiae* and *sufficiens gratia*. When grace assists then man does something which previously he could not do: He gives up resistance." So Drs. Richter, Schuette, and Schmidt at the Inter-synodical Conference, held in Fort Wayne, Indiana, Oct. 24th and 25th, 1906, as reported in *Theologische Quartalschrift* for April, 1907.

Such views are Melanchthonian. They posit some action of man's Will in conversion, and that is exactly what Melanchthon did. He held, as has been several time shown in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, that when the Word of God is heard, and the Holy Spirit assists, operates, moves, the Will of man is then not absolutely inactive but does something. By its natural powers it resists grace, but *adjuvante Spiritu sancto* it can assent to the promise.

showed in the THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1905, pp. 455 *et seqq.*, they not only incorporate in Article II. the typical language of the Flacianists, as *stock, stone, pillar of salt, Lot's wife, pure passive*, but in the *stratus controversiae*, they refer to a party who has held and taught that "before regeneration sufficient natural powers survive for him (man) to prepare himself to a certain extent for grace, and to assent, although feebly," * and they reject this as "false doctrine," but they do not say one word about or against the teaching of the Flacianists, and that for the reason that they are about to incorporate it in the didactic portion of the Article. Moreover, they even go so far as to write: *De tribus causis efficientibus, concurrentibus in conversione hominis non renati,* † which from its very form, as well as from the intention of the authors of the Formula of Concord, is meant to represent the teaching of the "Synergists," but which we do not hesitate to say cannot be found in, nor according to meaning, extracted from, the writings of Melanchthon, Pfeffinger, Strigel, nor from the writings *de libero arbitrio* of any man named by Schlusselburg as a follower of Melanchthon in teaching "synergism," for not one of them ever published such a sentence, or taught that man's Will is *causa efficiens* in conversion. Hence the authors of the Formula of Concord either adopted it from the Flacianists, or invented it, or picked it up in the circles of university students. At all events it is a fabrication, and it was used to bring the "synergists" into ill repute, and *per contra* to support and to propagate a doctrine of Free-will which never had authorization in the Catholic Church of Christ, and which had no authorization in the Lutheran Church during the first fifty years of its existence, and which has been a prolific cause of controversy, alienation, and schism, and which cannot be shown to be a generic and ecumenical doctrine of Lutheranism.

* Very properly does Dr. Jacobs say that this has reference to the "Synergists," "Philippists." *Book of Concord, The Confessions*, pp. 498, 551, marginal notes. See also Jacobs' Translation of *Book of Concord*, p. 567. Sec. 4.

† Müller, *Symbolische Buecher*, 7th ed. p. 610. Jacobs' Translation, p. 369, sec. 90. Dr. Jacobs appends a note to his translation of this Latin sentence as follows: "Melanchthon in *Loci Theologici* (1535), Pfeffinger, Strigel and others," meaning of course that the Formula of Concord refers to those men.

ARTICLE II.

LUTHERAN GERMANY AND THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 194).

VIII. SAXE-WEIMAR * (Grand-Duchy).

Saxe-Weimar was formed into an independent Principality in 1640. After a temporary subdivision the Principality was finally, on the death of the last duke of Eisenach in 1741, united into a compact whole under Ernest Augustus (1728-1748). At the Congress of Vienna a considerable increase of territory, together with the title of Grand-duke was awarded to Duke Karl August. The Constitution of the Grand-duchy was granted, May 5, 1816, the first liberal Constitution granted in Germany.

The area of Saxe-Weimar is 1,388 sq. miles, the population is 362,873, of these 347,144 are Protestants. The Established Church of this State is the Evangelical, "in fact a Union Church, even though the establishment of the Union can not be literally proved." † In 1818, due to the consort of the Grand-duke, Princess Sophia of the Netherlands, the Court and Garrison Church in Weimar was declared united. In 1824 a small residue of the French emigrant congregation, receiving concessions in the eucharistic rite, joined the Lutheran Church in Hilburghausen. Since 1843 one of the churches in Eisenach has been regarded as united, Hessian Reformed uniting with Lutherans in a special communion.‡ There are a few Reformed in the Grand-duchy, they have their own confession and ritual but stand under the supervision of the Lutheran Superintendent, and join to some extent with the Lutherans in com-

* Saxe-Weimar, Saxe-Meiningen (see XII.), Saxe-Altenburg (XIII.), Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (XIV.), Schwarzburg-Rudelstadt (XVI.), Schwarzburg-Sondershausen (XVII.), Reuss, Elder Branch (XIX.), Reuss, Younger Branch (XX.), constitute Thuringia and are treated under that name in a work like Herzog-Hauck. But as Thuringia has no longer any distinct terminal significance, we treat each State in the order observed by the Statesman's Year-Book, or Mullert.

† Löber, p. 33, n. (Cf. Köhler, *Deutsch-ev. Kirchenrechts*, p. 28).

‡ Article *Thüringen*, P. R.E. 2nd ed. XV, 650.

munion. A minister can pass from the Reformed, formerly Hessian, Church to Lutheran charges in the established Church, and vice versa, without any special formality.*

The Established Church of Saxe-Weimar shows that a de facto Union Church can confess the whole Book of Concord. The candidate for ordination swears to the following form: "You will swear that you will sincerely abide by the Pure Doctrine and Christian Confession as the same are grounded in the Books of the holy Apostles and Prophets, and contained in the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament, also comprehended and set forth in the Christian Book of Concord, so far as these later symbols agree with Holy Scripture; furthermore, that you will, to the best of your knowledge and ability, teach and adhere to the Pure Word of God, according to the principles, and in the spirit, of the Evangelical Church."

Saxe-Weimar has, approximately, 350 ministers. Its university † is at Jena, whose theological faculty, nominally Lutheran, is, and has been, a leader in rationalistic theology, no supporter of the so-called vulgar rationalism, however. At the *Allgemeine Konferenz* in Lund, the Church of Saxe-Weimar was represented by Kirchenrat Dr. Resch, of Jena.

IX. MECKLENBURG-STRELITZ (Grand-Duchy).

Mecklenburg Strelitz was separated from Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1701. The Congress of Vienna, 1815, acknowledged both as separate Grand-duchies. The area of Mecklenburg-Strelitz is 1,131 sq. miles. It has a population of 102,602, with 100,568 Lutherans, 70 pastors, and 153 Churches (Lutheran). In culture and advancement Mecklenburg-Strelitz is the same as Mecklenburg-Schwerin. The Grand duke is one of the wealthiest of German sovereigns, more than one half of the country being his private property. The morals of the people of this most thinly populated State in Germany are, with respect to the sixth commandment, the same as those of

* Mulert, p. 60.

† This university is common to the four Saxon Duchies : Saxe-Weimar, Saxe-Meiningen, Saxe-Altenburg, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha,

Saxony, the most densely populated State : the lowest in Protestant Germany.*

The Confession of M.-S., according to the Mecklenburg Church Order of 1650, is the Book of Concord. The stipulations regarding the rigid binding of theological research to the symbols, stipulations still in force, have not been applied for a long time (M. 61).

X. OLDENBURG (Grand-Duchy).

Oldenburg embraces an area of 2,479 sq. miles. The population of the chief divisions was in 1900 : Duchy of Oldenburg, 318,434; Principality of Lübeck, 37,340; Principality of Birkenfeld 43,406. Total 399,180. 309,510 are Protestants. The State has accordingly three independent Established Churches.

1. The Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Duchy of Oldenburg has 238,078 Lutherans, 75 per cent. of the population. Since 1853 the ordination vow of this Church reads thus : "I swear that I will preach * * * the Word of God according to the contents of Holy Scripture, being guided by the Augsburg Confession" (M. 61).

2. The Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Principality of Lübeck, with 36,912 members, 99 per cent. of the total, uses the same vow (1). In the call, the clergy are required "to preach * * * the Word of God, according to Holy Scripture and the fundamental principles of the Augsburg Confession." Though this Principality accepts only the Augsburg Confession, it was represented at the *Allgemeine Konferenz* at Lund by Kirchenrat Supt. Eutin.

3. The Evangelical Church of the Principality of Birkenfeld,

* It is statistically uncertain whether Creed as such exerts a determinable influence on the high percentage of illegitimate progeniture. The percentage of illegitimate births, based on the records for ten successive years, is highest in Bavaria, (13.63), where the Catholics are in majority. Then follows the Lutheran States of Mecklenburg-Strelitz 12.75; Saxony 12.74; Mecklenburg-Schwerin 12.35; Hamburg 12.03; the Thuringian States 10.45.

The average for the whole Empire is 9 per cent.

Below this average are Oldenburg 5.35; Waldeck 6.82; Lippe 5.05; Schaumburg-Lippe 3.80; Baden 8.00; Hesse 7.82; Alsace-Lothringen 7.98; Prussia 7.04.

with 34,520 members* (79 per cent.), uses, with a slight change, the same vow. For the words, "guided by the Augsburg Confession," as substituted: "having conscientious regard for the Augsburg Confession." It was in the thirties that the Union was established in this Principality, twelve Lutheran congregations uniting with two Reformed.

In the middle of the last century the Oldenburg Churches acquired some celebrity in attempting self-government. They were really favored, in 1849, with a democratic Church government, separate from the State. But in 1853 it was superseded by a new government, chartered without opposition. This restored the episcopacy to the ruler of the country; and transferred the government of the Church to a High Consistory, and the ecclesiastical legislation to a national synod (34 members). At the following synods the liberal and orthodox parties were standing in sharp opposition to each other. The orthodox had succeeded in carrying the motion that for membership in an ecclesiastical jurisdictional body, agreement with the Confessions of the German Reformation was necessary. But the Synod of 1870 (when a petition was circulated asking that liberty of conscience might be guaranteed), passed this resolution: "In consideration that the demanded agreement with the Confessions of the German Reformation is to be understood, not as agreement with every doctrinal tenet, but as agreement with the essential faith-content of the Confessions, the Synod enters upon the transaction of the day's business. †

XI. BRUNSWICK (Duchy).

The area of this State is 1,424 sq. miles, the population 464,333. Nearly the whole of the inhabitants of the Duchy are members of the Lutheran Church—432,570. Brunswick has 332 Lutheran Churches, 69 Chapels, and 26 "Betsälen." Since 1871, the Church has had a synodic form of government. The synod, consisting of 14 clericals and 18 laymen, meets every four years. For ecclesiastical legislation its sanction is

* For statistics see: H. A. Krose, *Konfessionsstatistik Deutschlands* (1904) p. 80; and P. RE. XIV. p. 353. The work of Krose (Catholic) is a good complement to Pieper's Church Statistics.

† Hase, *Neue Kirchengeschichte* II. 2, p. 552

necessary. The Consistory has charge of the special superintendency of church matters. Göttingen is the national university since 1809, when the University of Helmstedt was closed. Almost instinctively we associate the latter, one of the nine Protestant Universities of Germany founded in the sixteenth century, with the irenic theology of Calixtus (†1656), whose watchwords were concord and tolerance. The students of Helmstedt learned from him to enlarge the Confessional horizon—a welcome lesson when Calov, in Tholuck's words, "the mathematician of religion and Grand-Inquisitor," swayed the sceptre of dead orthodoxy. It was the more so, since the pastors in the city of Brunswick had so completely misunderstood and misinterpreted John Arndt and his "True Christianity," the irenic classic of the seventeenth century.*

Brunswick accepts all the Lutheran symbols excepting the Formula of Concord. Its clergy subscribe to the Corpus doctrinae Julium of 1576, the content of which has been specified elsewhere. (L. 18). Brunswick was represented at the *Allgemeine Konferenz* in Lund by Bender, Bosse, Dettmer, Eissfeldt, Grethe and others.

On the whole, the church life in Brunswick shows less activity than that of many other German states.† When the synod assembled in 1872, it turned down the motion to begin the sessions with prayer and Scripture reading.‡ But that this laxity in liturgy did not mean laxity in Creed, was shown at the next meeting in 1876, when the synod, receiving a protest against the Apostles' Creed as an integral part of the order of service, because it would curtail liberty of conscience, declared: "The Confession is in general norma normata, not norma normans credendorum."

XII. SAXE-MEININGEN (Duchy).

The line of Saxe-Meiningen was founded by Duke Bern-

* THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Oct. 1905, p. 547 f. Arndt repeatedly emphasized that he held the theology of the B. C. But, as Luthardt says, (*Geschichte der Christlichen Ethik* I. 270) a very charitable interpretation is needed to make Arndt's mystic a part of Lutheran teaching.

† P. RE. III. 362.

‡ G. Koffmane, *Abriss des Kirchengeschichte des 19 Jahrhunderts*, 116; Muler, 64.

hard, third son of Ernest I. of Saxony, the friend and companion in arms of Gustaf Adolf of Sweden. The Duchy was only one-third its present size up to the year 1826, when by the extinction of the ancient family of Saxe-Gotha the territories of Hildburghausen and Saalfeld fell to the father of the present Duke. The charter of the Duchy bears the date Aug. 23, 1829.

Saxe-Meiningen has an area of 953 sq. miles, a population of 250,731. 244,810 are Protestants. The Church is Lutheran. She possesses no fixed formula for ordination. But the minister after his ordination but before entering upon his duties in the congregation signs a vow that has been in use since 1843. In this vow he promises and swears that he will "preach * * * the Pure Doctrine contained in the uncorrupted Word of God; that he, will be guided by the fundamental principles of the Evangelical Church, giving conscientious attention to the public Confessions of the same. * * ." The Confessions of Saxe-Meiningen are the Book of Concord. (See the Church order of Casimer). In the *liber ordinatorum* (till 1840) the ordinandi have subscribed to the symbolical book *quia et quod* (not *quatenus*) and later only to sacred Scriptures. The congregational and symbolical order of Jan., 1876, declares: "The Confession is not an object of ecclesiastical legislation. Nevertheless, this statement shall in no wise bind free research in Scripture, and the progressive construction of doctrines resulting from this research" (M. 65).

XIII. SAXE-ALTENBURG (Duchy).

The Duchy has an area of 511 sq. miles, a population of 194,914, of which 189,855 are Protestants. Many of the inhabitants are of Slavonic origin. The peasants of the eastern part of the Duchy are reported to be more wealthy than those of any other part of Germany, and the rule prevails among them of the youngest son becoming the heir to the land and property of the father. Estates are kept for generations in the same family, and seldom parcelled out.

The force of custom is also seen in the religious sphere. Saxe-Altenburg follows at the ordination the liberal formula

used in the Kingdom of Saxony. This has been the rule for twenty years. Nothing concerning the formula has been prescribed by law. On the other hand the law prescribes that the pastor elect shall subscribe to the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The promise, which he signs is contained in a book deposited with the *Kultusministerium*. Its present form (from 1807) reads as follows: "Ego, (nomen) natus * * * rite vocatus et ordinatus, ex animi sententia polliceor et sancte in me recipio, in tradenda religionis Christianae doctrina sacram utriusque foederis scripturam tanquam normam illius unice rectam me bona fide secuturum eandemque salutarem doctrinam libris symbolicis ecclesiae Evangelicae-Lutheranae ad istam normam compositis convenienter traditurum esse.* The interpretation of it seems to be left with the subscriber.

XIV. SAXE-COBURG AND GOTHA (Duchy).

The area of this state is 755 sq. miles, the population 229,550. It numbers 225,074 Protestants. The state consists of two duchies, that of Coburg and that of Gotha. Each of these duchies has its own Established Church.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Coburg, with 64,821 members requires every candidate for ordination to subscribe to the Book of Concord, but he is permitted to add qualifying statements which exclude a binding to the letter of the Confessions. This has been the practice for several decades (M. 66. L. 70). The call stipulates "preaching of the Word of God * * * with conscientious regard to the * * * Confessions of our Evangelical Church * * *."

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Gotha, 160,253 members, confess the Book of Concord. The clergy must promise as a duty "piam libri concordiae perlustrationem," also "ut * * * doctrinam orthodoxam pia et decenti vita * * * ornent." But in Gotha, as well as in Coburg, the clergy is re-

* L. 69, 69, Cfr. "Beiträge zur Statistik der deutschen prot. Landeskirchen, 1846," (Leipzig) p. 31. This work (name of author not given) contains about 30 forms of Confessional Subscription then in use. Many are still in use. We have compared them (as well as those in Johannseens Untersuchung * * * Altona 1833) with those give by Löber and Mulert. We quote from the latter.*

quired to preach "with conscientious regard for the * * * Confessions," etc (as above). (L. 70).

XV. ANHALT (Duchy).

The area of Anhalt is 906 sq. miles, the population 316,085. It has 301,953 Protestants. The "Statesman's Year-Book, 1906" makes the claim that "nearly the whole of the inhabitants belong to the Reformed Protestant Church." Kattenbusch calls it "united (reformed")."^{*} But these statements need modification.

These are the facts: The relation of the House of Anhalt to the Palatinate, and the influence which the clergy of Franconia for a long time exerted on the churches in Anhalt, explain the endeavors of some Church leaders, supported by the Prince (at the close of the sixteenth century) to introduce certain customs from the Church Palatinate into that of Anhalt. But all the attempts to change the confessional status of the latter through formal acceptance of the Palatinate Agenda or the Heidelberg Catechism were in vain. The result of recent research is this: The designation "Evangelical Reformed" which was generally coupled with the Church of Anhalt rather indicates the Lutheran-Melanchthonian type which this Church has held fast to, over against the Lutheranism of the Formula of Concord.[†] The Catechism of Anhalt is Luther's, the text was officially adopted 1892. In some of the answers in the epitome, a few concessions have been made to the Reformed.[‡]

At one time Anhalt consisted of four principalities: Dessau, Bernburg, Cöthen, Zerbst. In 1606, these became independent of one another, and the Churches of the several principalities received their different modifications with the result, that Bernburg and Cöthen leaned toward the Reformed view, Zerbst stood for strict Lutheranism, Dessau emphasized what was common to both. The Dessau view gained the ascendancy and paved the way for the Union, this the more easily, since Zerbst ceased to exist as an independent principality in 1793.

* P. RE. XVI. 144.

† Ibid. I. 548.

‡ Ibid. X. 144.

In 1820 the Union was established in the Bernburg territory; in 1827, by joint communion, in the Dessau territory; finally in Cöthen by the *Unionsgesetz* of 1880. Thus entire Anhalt was Union. No infringement of the confessional status of the congregations was intended or made. They are at one in obligating the clergy "to preach the revealed doctrine of the Gospel according to the Confessions of our Church" i.e. the oecumenical symbols, the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology.* No mention is made of the Reformed Confession, either in the formula of subscription or in the questions put to the ordinandus.

The confessional consciousness is not strong in Anhalt. Formerly, whenever the religious census was taken, many, in designating to what Confession they belonged, would add to the more general designations of "Evangelical" or "Protestant" or "United," the special ones: "Lutheran, or Reformed."† Of late these specific designations have been omitted. It is therefore difficult to determine to what extent the inhabitants of Anhalt are Lutheran or Reformed. One thing is certain: United is not synonymous with Reformed. At the *Allgemeine Konferenz* at Lund, Anhalt had a representative in Harms, of Cöthen.

XVI. SCHWARZBURG—RUDELSTADT (Principality).

Area 363 sq. miles. Population 93,059. The Established Church is the Evangelical Lutheran, with 92,298 members. The Book of Concord is the Confession, subscribed to in the liberal ordination vow of the Established Church in the Kingdom of Saxony. (L. 60. M. 68. Cir. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1907, p. 90).‡

XVII. SCHWARZBURG—SÖNDERSHAUSEN (Principality).

Area 333 sq. miles. Population 80,898. 79,593 members belong to the Established Church, the Evangelical Lutheran. The Confession is the Book of Concord, especially the Augsburg Confession. The ordination vow of Saxony (as above) is followed. It was adopted in 1891 (L. 60. M. 69).

* P.R.E. I.549; M. 68.

† There are about 100 Alt-lutheraner in Anhalt.

‡ S-R. sometimes follows the ordination vow of Saxe-Weimar.

XVIII. WALDECK (Principality).

Area 433 sq. miles. Population 57,918. The Established Church is the United, with 55,285 members. The Union was established in 1821, it guarantees integrity of the respective Confessions, but stands for open communion. The Catechism is the Consensus. The Union here calls for agreement with the "principles of the Reformation, which are contained in the Confessions of the Reformation, especially in the Augsburg Confession" (M. 70).

XIX. REUSS, ELDER BRANCH (Principality).

Area 122 sq. miles. Population 68,396. The Established Church is the Evangelical Lutheran, with 66,860 members. The Confession is the Book of Concord. The ordination vow is much the same as that of the Lutheran Church in Bavaria (L. 64).

XX. REUSS, YOUNGER BRANCH (Principality).

Area 319 sq. miles. Population 139,210. Established Church is the Evangelical Lutheran, with 135,958 members. Confession: Book of Concord. Ordination vow: that of the Church of Saxony (L. 60).

XXI. SCHAUMBURG-LIPPE (Principality).

Area 131 sq. miles. Population 43,132. The Protestants number 41,908. The Established Church is the Evangelical Lutheran, with eighteen churches (the Reformed have two). The Lutheran churches subscribe to the B. C., Formula of Concord excepted. This is prescribed by the Church Order of 1614. At ordination the ordinandus is asked if he will preach "the revealed doctrine of the Holy Gospel according to the Confession of our Evangelical Lutheran Church * * * " (M. 72). The Lutheranism of Schaumburg-Lippe is mild, not exclusive (P. RE. XI. 518).

XXII. LIPPE (Principality).

Area 469 sq. miles. Population 138,952. The Protestants number 132,708. Lippe has forty-one Reformed Congregations, five Lutheran. The Reformed accept the Augsburg

Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. The Lutherans accept the B. C., excepting the Formula of Concord. As a rule, they call ministers that have been ordained elsewhere, or they follow the order of ordination prescribed by Württemberg (L. 47, 69, 71). Lippe manifests a great deal of interest in church work. Home, as well as foreign, missions receive much attention. The schools are excellent.

XXIII. LUBECK (State and Free City).

The State and Free City of Lübeck form a republic. The State comprises a territory of 128 sq. miles, of which the population is 96,775. The area of the city proper is 115 sq. miles, the population 82,098.

The Protestants of Lübeck number 93,671. They belong to the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The clergy subscribe to the Book of Concord. An example of the Dresden edition (1580) contains the names of the signers; the last signature was made in 1903. The subscriptions are various. Often the preacher signs his name with a "subscrispit" after it or with qualifying statements in periods of four or five sentences. The longest statements are met with in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the nineteenth, brevity gets the upper hand. The following are examples of shorter ones: *hanc confessionem corde amplector, ore profiteor, subscrispione approbo* (1611); *fida mente subscrispit* (1704); *libris symbolicis quia cum s. codice consentiunt subscr.* (1748); *libris symbolicis quatenus cum verbo divino consentiunt subscr.* (1794); *sincero animo subscrispsi* (1821). The present ordination liturgy contains no form of subscription (L. 14; M. 74). Lübeck has twelve parishes, twenty-one ministers, fifteen churches. The Senate is entrusted with the ecclesiastical government. Its sanction is necessary to the appointment of a minister. It empowers the *Kirchenrat* to act on its behalf, a council consisting of three clergymen, two of whom are senators, and three laymen. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century only Lutherans could be elected to the Senate of Lübeck. It was quite an event when the first Reformed senator was elected (1815). In 1848 political equality was attained. In January, 1905, the

"Bürgerschaft" did not number a single social democrat,* a most singular exception in the Parliaments of the separate German States. To maintain this condition a change was made in the Constitution (1905).

XXIV. BREMEN (State and Free City).

The State and Free City of Bremen (pop. in 1900, 208,815; in 1895, 195,510), form a republic governed by a Senate of sixteen members, chosen for life, forming the executive; and the "Bürgerschaft" of 150 members, invested with the power of legislation. The State embraces (a) the City proper (132,230 Protestants, with ten churches: six Reformed, three United, one Lutheran), (b) Vegesack (3,606 Protestants, one church, (c) Bremerhaven (16,773 Protestants, one Lutheran church, one United), (d) country territory (31,751 Protestants, twelve churches: nine Reformed, two United, one Lutheran). The Lutherans thus have the fewest churches. They are, however, numerically the strongest: Lutherans, 120,362; Reformed, 55,240; United, 8,758. The Dome is the only Lutheran church in the city, with more members than all the other churches. †

Bremen has no organized Church government. Through a commission on Church and Education, the Senate directs the external affairs of the Church. The separate congregations are autonomous. Inasmuch as the Confessional lines are very lax in Bremen, and the territorial boundaries of the respective churches a thing of the past, the congregations try to outrival

* In 1898, 2,100,000 German voters, of which at least 1,500,000 belong to the evangelical territorial Church, voted for social democracy. In Berlin three-fifths (157,000) were social democrats; in Hamburg two-thirds (78,000); in Saxony almost one-half (300,000),

In 1903-3,011,000 voted the socialistic ticket. Berlin, 218,000; Hamburg 96,000; Saxony 443,000; Out of Rostock's total, 9,648, the social democrats got 5,164 votes. They got 4,400 from the total in Pielefeld (7,771), the surroundings of which have more Christian monuments to show than any other city in Germany. Many of the social democrats are Church people, but this does not help to justify their platform (Gustav Ecke, *Die Evang. Landeskirchen Deutschlands*), 1904, 31 f.

† The statistics are for the year 1905.

one another through zeal in preaching and in charity work, thus practicing a proselytism which is far from healthful.

As to subscription, the Dome requires the ordinandus to preach "the gospel of Christ according to best knowledge and conscience, to hold such a doctrine and lead such a life as an upright servant of Jesus Christ can render account of before God." On the whole, all the churches of Bremen obligate, in one way or another, to the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism or simply to the preaching of the Gospel. In reality, the subscription in Bremen is, as Dr. Otto Funcke says, a "venerable form," to which no importance is attached in practice. In his church, Reformed, Lutherans, or United are equally welcome. In celebrating the Lord's Supper, "the bread is broken, not because the Reformed do this, but because the Lord distributed simple bread." Funcke leaves it with the individual to decide in what manner Christ is present in the Lord's Supper, "the Church has had just about enough controversy on this point."*

Doctrinal Indifferentism has swayed Bremen for a long time. Funcke characterizes the situation as a "veritable Tohu Wabohu." We can mention the bitter feeling which exists between the *Protestantenverein* and the *Evangelischer Verein*; the attempt to eliminate religious instruction from the schools; the abuse of Confession as it was manifested in the cases of the ministers Schwalb and Mauritz. Schwalb was allowed to remain in office and ministry, though his tenets were too radical even for the Protestantenverein.† Mauritz, at the Dome, used his own formula in baptizing, disregardful of the trinitarian formula. A stop was put to this by the decree of the Senate Feb. 3, 1905, which declared all the baptisms performed by Mauritz since May 1900 null and void. The decision was based upon the preacher's negligence in following the prescribed order. No action was taken against him for his preach-

* P. RE. III. 375 f.; M. 76 f.; L. 74 f.

† G. Ecke, *Die ev. Landeskirchen Deutschlands*, 259, note.

ing and teaching. He declared he would return to the use of the trinitarian formula.*

Those were the darker sides. And yet there is no city in Germany with so dark and deplorable phases that at the same time can show so many excellencies as Bremen.† As to activity, energy, self-sacrifice in Christian work, the citizens of Bremen are remarkable. The famous St. Stepani Church, built in the middle of last century, was the gift of seven citizens. Five other large churches, built recently, owe their origin to the same liberality. The great and noble missionary work, home and foreign, that Bremen conducts is most praiseworthy. Voluntaryism has a most staunch advocate in Germany's second port. It shows that the people, under no compulsion whatever, observe the church customs of old. Out of every hundred marriages, ninety-five are performed by the Church; out of every hundred children born, ninety-four receive baptism and are confirmed. But the percentage of those who commune is low: Fifteen per cent. The statistics for Christian burials is unfavorable: fifty-two per cent. The moral statistics are favorable.

XXV. HAMBURG (State and Free City).

The population of this republic is 768,349, of which 702,102 are Lutherans; 7,512 Reformed. The Lutherans comprise thirty-three congregations, with thirty-nine Churches. The formula of subscription obligates to the Book of Concord. It is long and rigid, covering no less than seven pages in the Agenda! In rigidness it is surpassed by no formula used by any other German territorial church. Rigid care is also taken to insure conformity with the Book of Concord by exacting repeated subscriptions. A theological graduate must, after his first examination and before getting his examination marks, subscribe to the B. C. He must again subscribe to it after passing the second examination. A third time, when he presents himself for ordination, and so on: Each advancement in

* Schneider, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (1906), 98 f.; M. 106; Weingarten-Arnold, *Zeittafeln zur Kirchengeschichte*, 6 ed. (1905), 236.

† G. Ecke, *I. c.* 259.

clerical rank means a new subscription. No qualifying statements, either oral or written, are permitted at the signing. The *quatenus*, at one time in use, is a thing of the past (L. 61 f. M. 79).

In sharp contrast to this Confessional rigidness stands the religious laxity, which characterizes Hamburg. The Church attendance is very poor.* In comparing Hamburg with the other German states we find that it stands lower than any other in the following particulars: In the percentage of those who attend communion † (8.83 per cent.); in the percentage of Protestant marriages solemnized by the Church ‡ (87.64); in the percentage of baptisms to births § (92.84 per cent. for legitimate children; 50.56 per cent. for illegitimate); in the percentage of burials solemnized by the Church || (32.45 per cent.) What an attitude of indifference!

The reason? It must not be lost sight of that Rationalism was a power in Hamburg fifty years ago, and that its destructive work cannot be effaced in one generation. Nor must it be overlooked that the State of Hamburg is, on the one hand, mainly city, without the redeeming qualities of country districts; on the other hand, a seaport with all attendant evils. But Berlin, too, is a city, and Bremen a port. But neither has such poor statistical showing in church matters as the great commercial emporium on the Elbe, notwithstanding that this is Lutheran, and those Union or "Unionistic." After all, does not some of the blame rest with Hamburg's pedantic and pietistic spirit of orthodoxy?¶

XXVI. ALSACE-LORRAINE (Imperial Land).

Alsace-Lorraine was reunited to Germany in 1871, when taken back from France, which had held it for more than two

* P. RE. VII. 383.

† Schneider *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (1906) p. 313.

‡ Ibid. 302.

§ Ibid. 298.

|| Ibid. 315.

¶ It is no surprise to learn that in Hamburg the two catechisms officially adopted (1753 and 1818) are "ganz veraltet Lehrbücher," (P. RE. X. 148).

centuries. Similar to our District of Columbia, but for other reasons, A-L is not included in any State. It received no autonomous government because it had become a member of the Confederation, not by agreement, but by conquest: It was put directly under the power of the Imperial government. The executive power rests with a Governor General, bearing the title of 'Statthalter'; he is appointed by the Emperor.

The area of the 'Reichsland' is 5,604 sq. miles, the population 1,719,470. According to the census of 1900, the inhabitants of German origin number 1,492,300, those of French 198,300. Many are bilinguals. The Foreigners counted were 65,251, a larger number in proportion to population than that of any of the other States of the Empire.

Of the total population, 372,078 are Protestants. Four-fifths of these are Lutherans, or members of the "Church of the Augsburg Confession," the name that the Lutheran Church in Alsace-Lorraine retains from the time that this territory was a part of France.* A body of five members called Direktorium, of which only one belongs to the clergy, is the Executive of the Church of the Augsburg Confession: it appoints the ministers, manages the finances and is the highest instance in disciplinary matters. The Direktorium is a part of the High Con-

* Only the garrison congregations are "Union." When Alsace was reunited to Germany, the Luth. Church of France received a most severe blow. Among her remaining 80—100,000 members there were two opposing tendencies at work, the unionistic and the pietistic; her very existence was threatened by the faction spirit. What would the confessional status be? The synod of 1872 proclaimed the Augsburg Confession as the only Lutheran symbol for the Lutheran Church in France. This saved Lutheranism for France. To adopt the B. C. would have been impossible; if possible disastrous. France has about 650,000 Protestants. They had from 1877 till 1906 a joint theological faculty (*faculté mixte*) at the University of Paris: one-half of the teaching force was Lutheran, the other half Reformed. This, however, did not mean Unionism in creed. The Protestants in France, persecuted as they had been, did not contribute much to independent theological research before the seventies in the last century. But then the new wide awake Paris faculty established its reputation. Its distinguished professors † Lichtenberger, Menegoz, † Sam. Berger (Lutherans), † Sabatier and Stapfer (Reformed) and others are the pride of French Protestant theology. (P. RE. VI. 193 ff.)

sistory (twenty-eight members) which meets annually in Strassburg and corresponds somewhat to a synod.

The Church of the A. C. is divided into seven 'Inspections.' At the head of are stand two laymen and one clergyman called inspectors. The clerical inspector may be compared to bishop or superintendent. The ordinandi come to him for ordination, for there are no less than seven that are used officially by the Lutheran Church in Alsace-Lorraine. Every candidate for the ministry has a right to petition the Direktorium to be ordained by the inspector from whom he wishes to receive the ordination.* This means that the candidate has his choice of formulas. Some of these are lenient, others more rigid. The seven formulas are the following: (1) The Hanau formula and (2) the Nassau-Saarbrücken formula obligate to the Augsburg Confession. (3) The Strassburg Church Order of 1670 calls for the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Formula of Concord. (4) The Württemburg Church Book calls for the Augsburg Confession. (5) A formula very similar to that of Bavaria 1853 calls for the Book of Concord. (6) The Palatinate Agenda of 1783 does not prescribe any Confession. (7) Entwurf einer Liturgie zum Gebrauch der Kirche Augsburgischer Konfession in Frankreich, 1856, calls for the Augsburg Confession. (L. 25, 26, 28, 43 ff., 50 f., 53 f.)

* * * * *

Having completed our survey, it is not amiss to make an attempt at summarizing.

First of all, we register the most certain and obvious fact that the established Churches observe no uniformity either as to the number of symbols accepted or as to the extent they obligate. The Confessional field at present very much resembles the political of a century ago, when every German statelet had its own measure, weight, and mint. It was an enemy that taught Germany the evils of political particularism, though the lesson of 1806 was not mastered before in 1870. Confessional Particularism, too, has received many blows. It may receive many

* L. 26, note.

more before it yields to better things. Though complete uniformity is neither possible nor desirable, there is nothing that can justify an order hard by the other extreme.

We will not attempt to find the golden mean, the difficulty of which is obvious to any one who has pondered the quoted words of Hauck in the first installment of this article. But we will not hesitate to broach two questions which must be answered before the golden mean can be found. They are:

(A) Should the Confessional subscriptions be rigid?

(B) Should all the symbols of the Book of Concord be subscribed to?

As to (A), all discussion concerning *quia* and *quatenus*—the watchwords which brought forth so much controversy in the thirties and forties of the last century—may be waived.* For, as Achelis says, “the principle of the Formula of Concord doubtless is the *quatenus*; it is first through investigation that *quia* may possibly be deducted.” Loofs has the same view.† In trying to deduce *quia* from the Book of Concord, our difficulties are not a few. Limiting ourselves to what the Lutheran symbols say about the sacraments, we ask: “Do these recognize three sacraments or only two, or do they differ among themselves?”‡ Again, “Is Art. IX: *De baptismo docent quod*

* One party claims the symbols are authoritative because (*quia*) they agree with Scriptures. The other claims they are authoritative so far as (*quatenus*) they agree with Scripture.

† Wenn auch hie “Apologie” oder Verantwortung des christlichen Concordien-Buchs [gestellt durch etliche hierzu verordnete Theologen im Jahre 1583] * * * erklärte, alle Schriften außer der hl. Schrift könnten und sollten nicht weiter angenommen werden dann als Zeugen der Wahrheit und sofern als sie mit der heiligen Schrift übereinkommen, so war doch nicht nur für die persönliche Überzeugung der Theologie der Konkordien formel dies *quatenus*, ein *quia*, sondern es galten auch auf Grund dieser Überzeugung die Symbole abweichendem Schriftverständnis gegenüber als *normae interpretandi*, welche die alleinige Autorität der hl. schrift illusorisch machten. (Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte*, 1906, p. 92 f.

‡ Kolde, in speaking of the Augsburg Confession, says “The author is content with stating in a few words the Lutheran doctrine concerning Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. A rejection of the other Roman sacraments is wanting. The way the author brings in Baptism and Repent-

sit necessarius ad salutem" able to stand before a *quia?* Achelis asks if an evangelical theologian can confess this genuinely Roman tenet without mental reservation or a forced interpretation. As a forced interpretation he regards the addition that John Gerhard makes to the *ad regenerationem et salutem necessarium*: "*interim tamen in casu privationis sive impossibilitatis salvari liberos Christianorum per extraordinarium et peculiarem*

ance (otherwise in the Variata) does not exclude the possibility of comprehending Repentance as a sacrament." (P. RE. II. 247).

Seeberg: "As the Augsburg Confession places Art. XIII. on the use of the Sacraments) after the discussion of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Repentance, it is evident that it recognizes three sacraments * * * but the Smalcald Articles enumerate two." (Seeberg, History of Doctrine II. 343, with note).

Loofs: "The three sacraments of Augustana and the Apology are Baptism, Absolution, the Lord's Supper." (Loofs, Dogmengeschichte, 1906, 824).

Kattenbusch: "In the two first editions of loci, Melanchthon regarded only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as the real sacraments. In the two following editions, as well as in the Apology, he recognized three: Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Absolution (P. RE. XVII. 373)." It was different with Luther: after breaking away from the belief in the seven sacraments, "he held fast to three till 1523, since then to two" (l. c.).

Schmidt-Hauck simply states that Luther believed in three sacraments. (Dogmengeschichte, 1887, 340).

Achelis: "I fear that a disciplinary investigation would be started against any one who would confess with § 4 of the Apology: 'Vere igitur sunt sacramenta baptismus, coena Domini, absolutio, quae est sacramentum poenitentiae.' Where can a theologian be found in the Evangelical Church who does not depart herein from the symbolical doctrine and from the quite intelligible words of the Apology, but who does not directly contradict it in instructing a confirmation class, on the basis of another symbol—Luther's Catechism?" Achelis, *Zur Symbolfrage*, p. II.

Both Kattenbusch and Achelis call attention to the fact, that with Luther, sacrament was a res sacra, but with Melanchthon a ritus. "But the ritus has the same, and no other, effect—neither more nor less—than the word of God. (Idem effectus et verbi et ritus, sicut praecclare dictum est ab Augustino sacramentum esse verbum visibile, quia ritus oculis accipitur et est quasi pictura verbi, idem significant, quod verbum. Quare idem est utriusque effectus)." Here again Achelis claims that the number of delinquent pastors would be great if their teaching were tested by the above, and that there would be no want of ecclesiastical authorities that would, to say the least, send a warning to those who would teach and catechize according to Apology, (ibid. II. f.; P. RE. XVII. 373).

dispensationem divinam. Necessitas enim baptismi non est absoluta, sed ordinata." (*Acielis, Zur Symbolfrage 1892*).

Quia will therefore have to be rejected as inadequate. But such a rejection does not mean the acceptance of *quatenus*, which is far less adequate than *quia*. With a *quatenus*, it has been said, a Protestant may subscribe to the decrees of Trent or even to the Koran. Really, nothing is gained by employing historic watchwords to conceal a dilemma.

Equally futile is a discussion of the concepts *norma normans* and *norma normata*, distinctions of but little practical value. The substantive being the same in both instances, its significance in the one concept cannot be greater than in the other: "A norm remains a norm, no matter how it got to be one." * Further, these concepts, as well as *quia* and *quatenus*, involve problems that concern Protestantism in general. The Episcopalians that subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Presbyterians that adhere to the Westminster Confession are as much interested in these problems as are the Lutherans. A solution, combining what is theoretical and universal, does therefore in the strict sense lie outside of the limits of this article.

In our answer to (A), then, we adhere to the practical phase of the question. We cannot but endorse the opinions of Mulert and Löber, now so well known to our readers as leading authorities on Confessional subscription.

Says Mulert in the preface to his valuable collection: "We have on the one hand striking examples which go to prove that the territorial Churches, in which a thoroughly Confessional theology is cherished, really have lenient formulas of subscription. We have on the other hand examples which show that the Churches, which adhere to rigid and antiquated formulas, are by no means noted for their strength in Confessional theology."

Löber closes his work with similar statements: "It may be easily seen that a rigid formula in itself offers no guarantee for the preaching of the gospel in demonstration of the Spirit and

* G. Braun, *Unsere Symbole, ihre Geschichte und ihr Recht*, (1875), 63.

of power; and that a lenient formula does not mean that religion runs the risk of getting shallow." Löber further states that the formula must be broad enough to take man's conscience into account. "Such a formula would be one where the doctrine of the symbols does not appear as the object of belief, but as an expression of belief. Not everybody will feel the burden of a rigid ordination vow: Certainly not he who is headstrong in opinion and faint hearted in criticism, and adheres to the traditional, because it is traditional; certainly not he who in spiritual sloth reposes on the couch of a mechanically acquired orthodoxy. It is a different matter with men of thought and conscience." Löbert, therefore, finds that many formulas stand in the need of revision. "But not even the most perfect revision will be of any benefit, where a congregation or church body interprets the normative significance of the Bible outwardly and values the Bible as a juridic quantity.* Of formulas that "are founded on a sound conception of Scripture and doctrine, and therefore do not burden the conscience," he selects as models —Loofs † agrees with him—the formulas of the Lutheran Church of Saxony; that of the Lutheran Dome in Bremen; that of the Moravian Brethren. "But even such model formulas are not a sufficient warrant for evangelical preaching: The most important remains that the pastor feels himself obligated to Christ, that he has laid hold of Him and is a true Christian. Such a pastor will not easily forget what responsibility is resting with him."

We turn to the second question (B): Should all the symbols of the Book of Concord be subscribed to?

The answer has in part been given by discussing (A), as well

* "Und nur die Kirche oder Kirchengemeinschaft wird aufhören das zu thun, die sich ernstlich—nicht nur in der Theorie sondern auch in der Praxis—freimacht von der unlutherischen, ungeschichtlichen und bei allem schein des Gegenteils doch sehr massiven Vorstellung von der Unfehlbarkeit einer wörtlich inspirierten Schrift." (Löber 77).

† "In the nineteenth century most of the evangelical churches in Germany, introduced broad-evangelical formulas, of which the most exemplary is that of the Lutheran Church of the Kingdom of Saxony (Loofs, *Dogmengesch.*, 1906, 946).

as by indicating the attitude of the several churches. In insisting on the subscription to the entire Book of Concord would be a disrespectful tribute to the wisdom and intelligence of the many Lutheran consistories and Churches that have never accepted the Book of Concord, or, if they had accepted it, have seen fit either to adopt as criterion a warrantable minimum, the Augsburg Confession, instead of the maximum of 1580, or to make the formula obligating to Book of Concord, so lenient that any true adherent of Scriptural Lutheranism might unhesitatingly subscribe to it.

A very calm and convincing discussion of the merits of the Augsburg Confession alone and of the whole Book of Concord as a symbol has been given by a Bavarian pastor, Braun, in a *Synodalarbeit* of 1875. He objects especially to the Formula of Concord. "It can hardly be called a Confession any longer; its contents lie for the most part beyond the division line which separates Confession from doctrine. When, nevertheless, the clergy are obligated to it, the voice of conscience will sometimes cry out in protest. But the protest is set aside by such assurances as: 'You are obligated not to the form, but to the content; not to one accident, but to one substance; not to the dress in which truth is presented; not to every method of establishing theological proof; not to every interpretation of Scripture passages; not to the non-fundamental, but to the fundamental; to the spirit of the symbols.' But such a subscription is ambiguous, since it is not stated what is fundamental, or not fundamental: the door is left open for arbitrariness or—what amounts to the same—the *quatenus* of old. Our symbols are at fault in having too little of the formula, too much of theological disquisition. But we cannot frame new symbols. Our age is not capable of such a task. We must abide by the old. It seems to me that what would be gained by a new symbol, were such a thing possible, might be gained by a simpler, a more natural, and—from an historical point of view—or more justifiable process: *By obligating to the Augsburg Confession only, instead of to all the Lutheran Confessions in general. For the Augsburg Confession is our Confession κατ ἐξοχήν.* It has

more of formula, less of disquisition, than the others. And it sets forth the claim of Lutheranism with such classic precision that a subscription to it would afford the necessary protection to the Church without burdening conscience." *

The note that Braun struck a generation ago seems to be sounded by Seeberg when he protests against that state of affairs which compels a pastor to make a subscription with mental reservation, or which dictates to the consistories the policy of interpreting a pastor's silence as consent, according to the proverb "*qui tacet consertive videtur.*" Seeberg claims that the difficult questions 'What does it mean to be faithful to the Confession?' and 'Where does actual ecclesiastical departure † from it begin?' are still waiting for their solution from Church and Theology. The solution, he holds, must not only do justice to the History of Dogma and to Dogmatics; it must also be concrete—plain enough to be grasped by the average layman. Seeberg foresees that the twentieth century in attempting the solution will witness not a few serious complications and conflicts. ‡

Language like this is, of course, only so much "cant" to those who do not distinguish between Theology and Confession and who treat the one like the other as exact science, the Book of Concord being made the logarithm of every doctrinal difficulty. To us it means that the B. C. is not the last word of Theology, and that less confusion is caused by following the Augsburg Confession than the entire B. C. as a *symbol*.

In our day it is necessary to emphasize the Lutheran confessional spirit over against radical theology—this fluttering bat that the sensational press magnifies into a soaring eagle. Would we then not do well to arm ourselves with the Book of Concord? For, has not Germany suffered by shelving it? We say:

* G. Braun, *Unsere Symbole, ihre Geschichte und ihr Recht*, (1875), 63.

† "In formulating the doctrines theologically nearly all deviate from it [the Confession"]. (Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands um XIX Jahrhundert*, 1903, 235.)

‡ The so-called "cases" (*Fælle*) in Germany mostly concern the ecumenical symbols. The "professor-controversy" in Norway is a better example.

No. For, in the first place, radical theology attacks fundamental truths of Christianity, common property of all Confessions, in defence of which no Reformation symbol is needed; in the second place, Germany is probably no weaker in orthodoxy than any other country. A few years ago it was claimed that 90 per cent. of the Protestant pastors in Germany belonged to the positive school; another estimate was 80 per cent. Knowing, as we now do, that the German pulpit stands for sermons of the positive order only, we believe we do not exaggerate in saying that over 95 per cent. of the sermons preached are "positive." (Can that be said of our American pulpit where we often have sermons of no order whatever?) Among the university circles the confessional status is less favorable, but by no means so radical as the reports would make believe. This appears also in E. Müller's "*Die neuesten Zeugnisse der theologischen Universitätslehrer gegen die radikale Theologie*" (1906,) containing quotations against the radical theology from over one hundred publications, of about sixty theological professors in the German universities. Seventy-five per cent. of the publications belong to the twentieth century, and over twenty per cent. to 1890-1900. They prove, as the author claims, that "a strong positive movement is at work against radical theology, a movement that is steadily expanding. * * * Many of the professors (that Müller quotes) are young in years. "We may expect that they will give us a large number of positive works and exert a strong influence upon the younger generation of students. The fundamental truths of Christianity, expressed in the Apostles' Creed, will continue to be advocated in Pulpit and University chair." (Müller, 157).

Müller calls attention to the fact that a simple reproduction of the orthodox Old-Lutheran "Kirchenlehre" (Book of Concord Theology) is not to be sought in the quotations that he has collected. On the whole, he identifies the authors of these with the modern positive school, which he praises in the highest terms and regards as the most formidable opponent of the radical school.

Why has he not drawn on the rechristianization theologians?

We answer, Where can he find them (we except common scolds)? What original contribution have they made to weaken the forces of the enemy? The fact remains: we have to draw on Müller's Confessionals. But their doom is apparently sealed (Schodde, quoted in LUTH. QUARTERLY, 1907, p. 193, note). Confessionals of Germany are, after all, different from what passes as such in the New World.

Would the intended *Allgemeine Luth. Konferenz* at Philadelphia, by adhering to the principle which challenged the orthodox integrity of the General Synod, have reversed the judgment and pronounced foreign visitors like Müller's Confessionals worthy of partaking in its proceedings? Consistent action permits of no other answer than a negative one. On the other hand we affirm that they would have had no difficulty in getting their credentials accepted. The reason is too evident to specify. We add, however, that if the professors in question—as incogniti, on their own merit, without "pull" or "politics"—were to be examined by some of our Book of Concord Boards at home, the outcome would be more than problematic. On both sides the surprises would be dealt out pretty evenly.

Incidentally we have thus learned that the Book of Concord is no more a *sine qua non* among the theological professors of the positive school than it is among the territorial Churches. Not that they disrespect it. For they, as ourselves, are deeply indebted to it as a most valuable and almost indispensable storehouse of theological learning. But are we so greatly indebted that we are morally obliged to subscribe to it as a *symbol*? A comfortable American-Lutheran majority answers in the affirmative. But what do the majority of the Lutherans in Europe say?

The Lutherans in Europe that do not accept the Book of Concord are: (a) 22,000,000 in Germany; (over two-thirds of her entire Lutheran population); (b) 2,500,000 in Denmark (entire State including Iceland); (c) 2,250,000 in Norway (entire State); (d) 1,289,000 in Hungary (entire Lutheran population *); (e) 372,000 in Austria (entire Lutheran population)

* See subscriptions in M. 95 f.; P. RE. XVI. 144 f.; Statesman's Year-Book, 1906, p. 665, 684.

(f) 60,000 in France (entire Lutheran population); (g) 83,000 in Holland; * (h) 400,000 in (Russian) Poland. † Thus 29,954,000, almost two thirds of the European Lutherans eligible to the present count would have been shut out from the Philadelphia Conference. We regard Sweden as neutral. Whether she stands for the Book of Concord or not will have to be decided by herself. ‡ As a matter of fact, the American B. C. faction (opposed as it is to liberal subscription, to federation movements, to lodges) has less claim upon her than have the rest of us. Her liberal formula of subscription, her friendly attitude to the Evangelical Alliance, the fact that her *summus episcopus* is Free mason § are matters that many of her Amer-

* From P. RE. VIII. 272 f.; Koffmane, *Abriss der Kirchengeschichte*, 149.

† An inference; but well supported from the fact that the Consensus of Sendomir was, in 1595, declared to be in force and obligatory for every pastor. It was endorsed again in 1728. It has never been repealed, P. RE. XV. 521 f. The Reformed and the Lutherans were united under one Consistory, (1828-49). The present polity dates from 1849, (P. RE. XVII. 261). In 1861 there were 286,291 Lutherans, but only 5,292 Reformed. Any Agenda could be used by the pastor (*Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 267, f.). The greater portion of the members are Germans.

‡ LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 1907, p. 7.

§ We refer to King Oscar II., who also was *summus episcopus* of the Church of Norway up to the recent separation. The *summus episcopus* of the Danish Church is a mason. Likewise all the Prussian kings from Frederick the Great to Frederick III (1888 †). The present German Emperor broke with tradition by having Prince Leopold of Prussia appointed instead of himself. The reasons were political. (P. RE. VI. 260; Meyer's Konversationslexikon, 6 ed., VII. p. 74.)

N. B. The Lutherans in the Dispersion or in the Mission Fields are not counted. In these territories, too, the Book of Concord men are in minority. It suffices to quote from the Norwegian Mission. Of India's 155,455 Lutherans, 11,000 converts belong to the Santhal mission, conducted by Norwegians and Danes. At Madagascar the Norwegian Mission had, in 1900, 62,000 converts, 48,000 school children, 80 missionaries. Says Warneck about the work of the Norwegians in Madagascar: "Ihre Arbeit ist die solideste und hoffnungsvollste in Madagascar, wie ihre Missionsleitung daheim und draussen eine musterhafte" (Warneck, *Abriss einer Gesch. der prot. Missionen*, 1901, p. 246). He speaks in highest terms of the Santahl Mission also. Now, the missionaries in question are not Book of Concord men. And the results would be no better if they were. On the contrary, the Augsburg Confession is the ideal, if we care at all to trust the opinion of the world's acknowledged

can friends would take exception to.

What do the Ayes say? How many are the Lutherans in Europe that accept the B. C. and thus have the right to delegate representatives to a Book of Concord Conference? We answer six million Russian subjects, and ten million German, a total of 16,000,000. But of the ten million Germans one half at least (Saxony and most of the Thuringian States) subscribe to the B. C. in terms that no Lutheran can justly object to. Of the six million Russian subjects, 3,322,000 constitute the Luth. Church of Russia, with the University of Dorpat (Erlangen-school theology) as the theological centre. More than half of the members of this Church are German. 2,662,000 belong to the Church of Finland, with the University of Helsingfors as the educational centre, more confessional than Dorpat, but less influential in theology.*

* * * *

In the light of the foregoing, a B. C. Conference would have turned out a failure. And no European Church of note would

* The Finnish Church is autonomous, quite independent of Russia's ecclesiastical legislation. She has preserved many of the characteristics of the Swedish Church, of which she was a part until 1809, when Finland was ceded to Russia. This accounts for the acceptance of the B. C. (Sweden modified her subscription after the separation). To what extent the Fins obligate to the B. C., I am unable to say. Finland's greatest enemy to-day is not Russia, but Socialism. Many of her clergy are hierachial; correspondingly, many of her Church members hold extremely individualistic views on religious matters.

The "Luth. Church of Russia" does not enjoy such privileges in her relations with the State. The Russian government has treated her with authority on Missions, Prof. Warneck of the University of Halle. In his "*Missionslehre*" (1897-1903) he claims that no missionary ought to be required to subscribe to the Book of Concord, the Augsburg Confession being sufficient. If we Lutherans of America would care to take another hint from Warneck, one like the following ought not to be so much out of the way: "Hätten sie [die lutherischen Kirchen Nordamerikas] nicht soviel unfruchtbare konfessionelle Streiterei unter sich geführt, so stände im Vergleich mit den übrigen Denominationen ihre Tätigkeit für die Heidenmission nicht soweit zurück." Warneck, *Abriss*, 119. In Schneider's *Jahrbuch*, 1906, we hear a similar reproach against our pinched contributions to foreign missions.

have proposed it. This may be affirmed of Germany. For

severity. Nevertheless, she has succeeded in doing a noble work. Her University is liberal-conservative. A number of brilliant theologians have been connected with it. One gets a good idea of the Dorpat faculty by reading the "*Dorpater Zeitschrift*," which it edited. Among other things in this, we call attention to the characteristic utterance of one of her faculty in commenting on a Lutheran Conference held in 1858 at Rothenmire (*Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1859, p. 133). "Scheint es nicht das Uebermass confessioneller Beschränktheit zu verrathen, wenn Rosstöcker Docenten und Mecklenburg'sche Pastoren, so wie Pastoren der separirt-lutherischen Kirche Preussens aussprechen, dass ein echter Lutheraner mit einem Reformierten nicht einmal beten könne?"

In this excellent *Zeitschrift* there is one article in particular that we call attention to: "Was heisst Kirchlichkeit," by Consistorialrath Carl-blom in Livland. Though written fifty years ago it ought to be translated into English and spread broad cast before our Lutherans at home. The article discusses with great ability not only the attitude of eminent Erlangen theologians to the B. C. but also the attitude to it of some American Luth. Church bodies. It is quite interesting to listen to a pastor in Russia accusing us (and does he do it unjustly?) of symbolriding. "Ueberhaupt hört man in jenen Kreisen gar zu viel: 'die Bekenntnisschriften sagen so, Luther sagt so, die Bekenntnisschriften sagen so' und—Amen," (p. 20; Cfr. 64ff.; 347ff.).

The persecution of the Russian Lutheran Church began with Nicholas I. The Nicholas system enjoined that every mixed marriage (Luth. and Greek Catholic) should be celebrated before a *pope* and that the children of mixed marriage should be brought up to Greek Orthodoxy. Any Lutheran pastor officiating at such a marriage was to be punished. The provision was abolished in 1865, but reestablished in 1885, and is still in force. Greek and Roman Catholics, and Jews were forbidden to join the Protestant Church. Abjuration is punished with confiscation of property and prison labor. To attempt to convert a Greek Catholic to the Protestant faith is a misdemeanor. The Greek Church, however, shirks nothing in order to gain a Protestant over to her faith. Various trickeries have been resorted to. It has often happened (Hase, *K. Gesch.* II. ii., p. 945) that Protestant soldiers, doing duty in the interior, were enticed or ordered to commune in the State Church. This act of communing forthwith made them irrevocable members of the Greek Church. On returning home they found that the Protestant pastors had been notified about the abjuration and forbidden to take the converts back into their folds. In 1845-6 about 50,000 Littonians and Esthonians left the Luth. Church to join the Greek, expecting, by way of recompense, to get some grants of land. They got no land. And they could not go back to the Church they had abjured until Alexander II (1855-81) got to the throne. With him began a liberal reaction. In an unofficial way he promised the "converted" an unmolested return to the Luth. Church. Thirty thousand took advantage of his permission, only to find out that they were

she is too well aware of the situation at home and abroad to motion anything so desperately unhistorical as a *General Lutheran Conference* on the basis of the B. C. The same may be affirmed of the other Lutheran nations in Europe, who are at one with Germany in this matter, as in so many others where our American Synods would find coveted opportunities for strife and schism. The foreign Churches are still sympathizing with one another, sparing no pains to keep well informed of the theological and ecclesiastical constellations.

This can, only in a limited sense, be said about our Churches. Each synod seems to be pulling her own way—away from the sister synods and away from the Alma Mater of them all—too “modern” for one extreme, too “old-fashioned” for the other, witnessing the aggressive conceit of the one, and the lofty scorn of the other. We are alas courting with increasing ardor the penalty of exclusiveness and isolation. Look around! What have we that can be compared to the foreign Lutheran theological press and library, to the foreign Lutheran university? Assuredly the time has not yet come when one synod can dispose of the other and dismiss her as superfluous. We need them all. But more than ever, do we need the coöperation of Lutheran Europe: what she gave us in the past, what she gives us in the present.

As to the rest, B.C. Lutherans or not B. C. Lutherans, we need not fear, for we know that the words of Christ spoken in response to the *first and most important Confession* ever made are true: The gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church. (Math. 16: 18).

reclaimed by Alexander III. (1881-94). 105 of Livlands 135 pastors who refused to acknowledge his claim were tried before Greek Catholic tribunals, or disciplined. The University of Dorpat was Russianized, only the theological faculty being permitted to retain the German as its language of instruction. Poorly educated students of the nihilistic trend were made the associates of the cultured student body, and the scholarly rank of the University was lowered. Various troubles have rested heavily upon the Luth. Church of Russia. The end is not yet, though the Edict of Tolerance, 1905, made a change for the better, thanks to the Czar, who favors religious liberty, but whose edicts are often ignored and violated by his highest government officials. (Cf. Schneider's *Jahrbuch*, 1907, p. 189 f.)

ARTICLE III.

PAUL GERHARDT IN THE CHURCH TROUBLES OF HIS TIME.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

The Lutheran Church was from the beginning a singing Church. Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, was opposed to singing in the congregation. Once he appeared before the city council of Zurich and sang a petition. When the members of the council expressed their surprise, he said: "So it is when we sing our prayers and praises to God in the Church." But Luther, the reformer and author of so many theological works, was at the same time the creator of German hymnology, and he has been followed by a host of God-endowed men who have given to the Church hymns that will never die. Of the Lutheran Church it can be truly said that from her origin she has sung the Gospel truth into the hearts of the people. The Reformed churches have not clung to the error of their founder and, during the last century especially, have been lively competitors of the Lutheran Church in the composition of beautiful hymns.

Without question the "Assaph" among the hymn writers produced by the Lutheran Church is Paul Gerhardt, the three hundredth anniversary of whose birth we celebrate this year. His hymns are immortal and have been translated into many languages. That which characterizes him is the perfect blending of two factors which, in only too many cases, have a separate existence in the Christian individual: On the one hand painstaking devotion to the confessions of the Church, the whole theology of the Form of Concord included; and, on the other hand, a personal piety, a mystical union of the soul with the living God. It is the perfect harmony of these two elements that gives the peculiar charm to so many hymns of Paul Gerhardt. And then, while his songs breathe the spirit of Lutheran orthodoxy, inseparably wedded to Christian piety, there is such a recognition of the natural in man which must

only be sanctified, that the chords of his harp touch the believer and the unbeliever alike.

But it is not my task to picture to you Paul Gerhardt as a hymn writer. After a very brief review of the earlier part of his life I shall attempt to show you how this godly man acted in a doctrinal controversy in which he became involved, and which, because of the scantiness of other historical accounts, is, outside of his hymns, the only means to become acquainted with him.

Of his personal relations we do not know much. He was born the 12th of March, 1607. When he was twelve years of age the Thirty Years War broke out. Perhaps the horrors of this terrible war aided in giving him that serious turn of mind, that depth of character and that earnestness which characterized him all through life. The indescribable miseries attending a war of that character tend to drive the individual to a decision, either for Satan or for God. Gerhardt chose the better part. He studied theology at the then famous Lutheran university of Wittenberg. Here he received his deep impressions of the peculiar character of Lutheran theology, and became convinced that this system only was founded upon the Scriptures; and here he was schooled in the art of defending the Lutheran confessions against the attacks of Kryptocalvinism and Syncretism. But after he had completed his studies, notwithstanding the fact that he was known as hymn-writer all over the land, and his songs had been printed in many hymnals, he reached the age of forty-four before a congregation called him. This failure to receive a call was due to the poverty and the misery that the war had brought upon the land. Finally in 1651 he became pastor of a congregation in Mittenwalde. Here he married a lady from a family of position in Berlin and was soon transferred to that city as an assistant pastor of a large congregation. In Berlin he became entangled in the struggles of Lutheranism against the Great Elector, Frederick William, who wanted to exterminate the Lutheran Church by uniting it with the Reformed, of which he was a follower.

We shall now try to give a short review of these church troubles so far as it is helpful to produce before us a picture of Paul Gerhardt, and so far as it is necessary to understand his actions.

In the history of Prussia there is besides Frederick the Great no name more celebrated than that of Frederick William, the Great Elector of Brandenburg. He was a sincere Christian. During his boyhood, while the Thirty Years War was raging, he was under the pious influence of three excellent women: His mother who was Reformed, his grand-mother Anna, widow of the late Elector, Sigismund, and his aunt Eleonore, the young widow of Gustavus Adolphus. When as a young man visiting at a foreign court and, by a frivolous society, was induced to participate in the sins of the flesh, he, of quick resolve, fled with the words: "I owe it to my parents, to myself, and to my country to keep my record clean." When he had come to the throne, he chose in the princess Louise Henriette of Holland, author of the hymn: "Jesus Thou My Refuge Art" (*Jesus meine Zuversicht*) a companion of the same pious character. When in times of war a march on Sunday was unavoidable, his soldiers had to halt at least for half an hour, in order that a service could be held. But this pious man was, in contrast with the overwhelming majority of his people, Reformed, and with all the fibers of his soul rooted in the more subjective piety, characteristic of the Reformed Church, he was unable to understand the emphasis which Lutheranism lays upon the objective features of our Christian faith as they come to an expression in its peculiar doctrines and in church practice. And now his policy was to unite the Lutherans and the Reformed so that they by and by might become blended into one Church. If such a union is to be effected by compelling the Lutherans to sacrifice the doctrines which their great reformer had defended and which had been laid down in the Augsburg Confession, then they cannot participate in such a movement without being untrue to the truth committed to their care. And here it was the special mission of Paul Gerhardt,

by word and deed, to act as spokesman for the interests of the Lutheran Church.

In 1662 the Great Elector ordered the Lutheran and the Reformed clergymen of Berlin to participate in a doctrinal discussion looking towards the establishment of peace between the two churches. The subject for discussion was the following question: "Whether there was anything taught in the Reformed confessions because of which the individual who believes and teaches it, by divine judgment must be damned; or whether in the confessions of the Reformed Church * * * there was anything denied or omitted the unacquaintance with which on the part of an individual will make it impossible for God to save him." This theme dictated by the Reformed court preachers was in itself captious and ensnaring for the Lutherans. They might reply to such question in the negative or in the affirmative, in each case they would be entrapped. If they would say No, then their opponents would ask them: Why not then accept the consequences by dropping the differences and uniting both churches into one body? If they would answer Yes, then they had condemned their sovereign and many others who were sincere Christians. Stahl says in his estimate of the situation (*Lutherische Kirche und Union*, p. 341): "With equal right could Louis XIV. of France have asked this question of the Huguenots in order to drive them to the conclusion that they had no right to hold themselves separated from the Catholic Church." There was one thing which Frederick William had overlooked when he framed that question as a basis upon which a union of the two churches should be effected. I will express it in this thought: While one readily admits that the individual members of the Reformed Church, innocently sharing some errors of the denomination in which they have been brought up, can be saved, yet from this does not follow that the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church are a matter of indifference. Our peculiar Lutheran doctrines in regard to the person of Christ and to the means of grace are founded upon Scripture. The Lutheran and the Reformed conceptions are not two views with equal

right of existence ; but, according to our conviction, the Lutheran doctrines are Scriptural while the Reformed Church, misled by a priori speculations (which is especially true of Zwingli) has failed to find the true Biblical point of view. And now we say : A Church that derives the subject-matter of its spiritual instruction from a true understanding of Scripture is better equipped to be a leader of immortal souls in their seeking after salvation. With this we do not say that a church which, like the Reformed, teaches Christ and preaches the doctrine of atonement cannot also lead souls to the Saviour ; and much less would we say that the individual members of such Church cannot be saved. I purposely wanted to offer these statements as a guide before we begin to describe the debate in question, for the reason that even Paul Gerhardt, as a child of his age, has not always been able to find the exact language to express the relation.

The conference was held in seventeen sessions, covering a period of one year and a half, from September 8, 1662 to the 29th of May the following year, and was exceedingly unedifying and unpleasant. To our Paul Gerhardt fell the lot of acting as a secretary for the Lutherans. Thus he has written theological opinions and replied to written statements of the Reformed. The originals of these documents are preserved in the secret state archives of Berlin and are all printed by Langbecker in his documentary life of Paul Gerhardt. There they cover fifty printed pages in the German and Latin languages. In reading them one will sometimes pause and ask : Is the author of these documents which show such acumen in logical definitions and a master in the field of theology and which remind us of the work of a Calov and a Hutter—is the writer of all this really the same person that we know and love from the warm-hearted hymns of Paul Gerhardt ? But it is he, and this may be evidence that the Lutheranism of the type of our fathers in the 16th and 17th centuries can be harmoniously united with a spirituality that was not surpassed by Spener and Francke. Yet also in these theological opinions we are attracted by that tender conscience of Paul Gerhardt that has

through all his life continued to be the mainspring of each and all of his actions. He will rather suffer the worst than betray even a particle of the truth as he has been lead to know it. The position which Paul Gerhardt, together with the other Lutheran ministers in Berlin, took, and to which he gave expression in these documents is this: In the holy Scriptures we have a clear revelation of the saving truth. To this saving truth belong the articles which the Lutheran Church confesses against the Reformed. Nothing of this saving truth can be either denied or disregarded by the individual without imperiling his salvation. God cannot save an individual who, after having been sufficiently instructed, persistently up to his death refuses to accept the truth. The Reformed, especially their ministers, have been sufficiently instructed through the many discussions of the past and present. They persist in their errors against better knowledge and conscience. If they are saved it can be only because God in his mercy overlooks the weakness of men. (Langbecker p. 73, 88, etc). They, the Lutherans, would respect and love them, they would also desire and hope for their salvation; but passages of Scripture like Galatians 1 : 8 forbid them to take any other position.

We Lutherans of our age would not express ourselves this way. We have learned something since the days of Paul Gerhardt. We have studied church history. We have observed the piety of men like Zinzendorf, the Wesleys, Bunyan and Baxter and Spurgeon, and we have seen the missionaries of the Reformed Churches sending streams of blessing to the heathen nations. All such observations have given us a more vivid conception of the Church invisible as represented in all denominations that confess Christ to be the Son of God. And we have been compelled to revise the methods of our fathers in applying the anathemas of Scripture to the individuals of other churches. Today even the strictest of Lutherans would not repeat every sentence of Paul Gerhardt without qualification. But his conception was the position of all Lutherans in his day. The Students of theology were trained in such convictions at the universities. It was a two-fold mistake under which

Paul Gerhardt and his Lutheran contemporaries were laboring. First, a psychological mistake: It is a matter of course that a person who has grown up as a member of another denomination will not become Lutheran, unless it be in exceptional cases, where peculiar influences have been brought to bear upon him; an inborn filial regard for the religion of the fathers will stand in the way. When, in seasons of heated discussions, a Reformed begins to weigh the reasons in favor of and against the truth of his confessional system, then in by far the most cases and without suppressing the voice of conscience, the scale will turn in favor of the denomination in which he was born; cases to the contrary are exceptions, and even among these a large percentage of those who decide to become Lutherans is not due to conviction from doctrinal arguments, but has to be traced back to conditions and developments of personal character. And second, the standpoint of Paul Gerhardt and his fellow-Lutherans involved a theological error. They overlooked the fact that it is not the adoption of single and separate articles that saves us, but true faith in Christ as the Saviour from guilt and sin. Christ is the center (*the articulus constitutivus*, as Philippi says). Other doctrines, which according to their immediate importance for the comprehension of Christ as the Saviour place themselves in concentric circles around the center, are also essential and cannot be arbitrarily rejected; but of the *individual members* in the Reformed churches we dare not say that their rejection of the distinctive doctrines of Lutheranism decides the eternal doom of their souls. With the *Church* it is different. To her and her ministry is committed the care of so many. It is therefore of the greatest importance that in the pulpit, at the altar and in dealing with individual souls this institution can do her work under the guidance of a doctrinal system that is the best interpretation of the Scriptures.

But even if Paul Gerhardt did not quite succeed in finding the proper language to define the truth, yet all that he said and wrote was dictated by a truly Christian spirit, and it was the expression of a tender conscience. The same thoughts which his colleague, Reinhardt, could not utter without rousing the

anger of the opponents, these Paul Gerhardt could offer in such a manner that they were not felt as an insult. This is possible only for the person that stands under the special influence of the Spirit of Christ. That Paul Gerhardt, in defending the position which we have described, acted according to the dictates of his conscience we see from the fact that, in the face of death a number of years later, he wrote in his last will to his son, a prospective student for the ministry: "Be careful to study the sacred theology at pure schools and unadulterated universities, and beware of Syncretists, for they seek the things of this world and are true neither to God nor men" (Lgb. p. 227). If he could write thus in the face of death he must have been sincere, and could not have spoken out of mere passion for strife.

The conference of which the Great Elector hoped so much had passed off without result. The feelings between the contesting parties were only more bitter than before. Now Frederick William did something that soon proved to be the most serious consequences for the life of Paul Gerhardt. On the 16th of September, 1664, he issued a decree in which the ministers of both parties were forbidden to characterize in the pulpits the doctrinal position of their opponent by carrying them to their logical conclusions. The Lutherans were not allowed to say of the Reformed that they teach God to be a cause of sin; that Christ had not died for all men (conclusions from the doctrine of predestination); that Christ in respect to his human nature is confined to heaven or that not the whole Christ is present with us; that the Sacraments are nothing but tokens and signs. (The edict is printed by Langbecker in full, pp. 91ff.). The ministers were also forbidden to call their opponents by offensive names. The Lutherans must not call the Reformed Calvinists, Zwinglians, Syncretists. And then it was ordered that all clergymen of Berlin, on pain of being removed from their offices, should sign a "reverse" (a written obligation) in which they promise to obey the decree. Two of the Lutheran ministers, Reinhardt and Lilius, who, in the opinion of the Great Elector, had been too severe against the Re-

formed during the conference, had to sign this "reverse" immediately and, refusing to do so, their pulpits were declared vacant. The other ministers, including Paul Gerhardt, should be given a short time to consider.

Now while we leave Paul Gerhardt considering, let us ask the question: Could the Lutheran ministers of Berlin sign such a "reverse" without wounding their conscience? We can best reach a conclusion after we have studied the whole situation by casting a retrospective glance at the recent church history of Brandenburg. Only fifty years ago Brandenburg was an exclusively Lutheran country with not even a single Reformed congregation existing. Then it occurred that the Elector Sigismund, grand-father of Frederick William, renounced Lutheranism and went over to the Reformed Church. This caused great consternation among his people. We must remember that it was the same time when Lutheranism was struggling for its very existence with Kryptocalvinism, that is, with a Calvinism that was trying to creep in under the guise of an improved Lutheranism. True, at the accession to the throne Sigismund had given a written promise to protect the Lutheran Church even in its confession to the Form of Concord. But on the other hand, the sentence "*cujus regio ejus religio*" was considered a legal maxim among princes and peoples of Germany. And almost immediately Sigismund began to work for the conversion of his Lutheran subjects to the Reformed Church with a zealousness bordering on fanaticism. For instance, he sent personal invitations to all whom he could influence to go with him to communion after the Reformed manner. At the first of these Reformed communions he was not able to bring together more than fifty-five people. (Wangemann, Johann Sigismund und Paul Gerhardt, p. 30). He considered Lutheranism as a remnant of Catholic superstition. He looked at the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of the body and the blood in the communion as being practically the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, which Luther had kept only to please Charles V. Melanchthon then, in the Altered Augsburg Confession of 1540, had given us the pure doctrine of the

Lord's Supper. Sigismund considered it his calling to carry out a "reformation" of the Lutheran Church in his country, doing away with the so-called remnants of the old Roman leaven. Yet there was not one Reformed minister in all Brandenburg. Soon he found one man (Fink) who was willing to change his confession and to serve him as a court preacher. A second man was called from a neighboring country. A third man, intended to be the theological leader in the "reformation" that now should be undertaken (Fuessel), came from Heidelberg, headquarters of the Reformed Church. Now the work began. The Dome, a famous church edifice in Berlin, was taken away from the Lutherans and handed over to "those of the true religion." In the edict (1614) the Form of Concord was set aside and the Augsburg Confession was supplanted by the altered edition of 1540. (This decree, however, Sigismund was soon compelled to revoke again). The Lutheran university of Frankfurt on the Order was converted into a Reformed institution (Wang. p. 89). No student could become a beneficiary except he joined the Reformed Church. Some such beneficiaries were sent to Heidelberg that they might be nurtured with Calvinistic theology at the fountain-head. (Wang. 86). A board had been created whose special duty it was to carry out the so-called reformation of the Lutheran Church. (Wang. 85). So the plans were laid in this exclusively Lutheran country to exterminate Lutheranism and to supplant it by Calvinism. The Lutheran Church had to struggle for its existence, and by special order to the printing offices she was forbidden to use the press, while her opponents were at liberty to attack her as they pleased.

The wife of Elector Sigismund, Anna, had remained Lutheran and could by no means be induced to follow her husband into the Reformed Church. Even in her last will she ordered that her burial services should be conducted by a Lutheran minister who, on that occasion, should declare in a suitable manner that she had been opposed to the innovation of introducing Calvinism into the country. She survived her husband for many years and, together with her daughter, the widow of

Gustavus Adolphus, was permitted to do much to instil into her grand-son, the Great Elector, the Christian principles which characterized him. To her country she was known only as "Mother Anna," and to her the Lutherans appealed in many a trouble, and wherever she was able to help, she did so *

The son of Elector Sigismund, George William, was not quite so zealous in the "reformation," because he was hindered by the troubles of the Thirty Years War; but there is much evidence to show that he was also pursuing the policy of a gradual annihilation of the Lutheran Church. (Comp. Wang., pp. 110 to 116).

Then came Frederick William, the Great Elector with whom we are acquainted. Under him the situation received a somewhat different appearance. He invited the Reformed who were persecuted in other countries, especially the Huguenots in France, to settle in his domain. In this way thirty four Reformed congregations were established, and in his possessions to the West which came to him by inheritance there was also a Reformed constituency. The policy of the Great Elector is not any more, as with Sigismund, to make the Lutherans Reformed. But his aim is union. The Lutherans and the Reformed are to be blended into one denomination and this was to be effected not by a real agreement in the truth, but, according to the suggestions of Syncretism, in the way of ignoring the confessional differences. It was a union of such kind that was intended by the Great Elector when he called that conference of which we have spoken. And the Lutheran ministers of the capital should pave the way. It was hoped that when they de-

*The steadfastness of this woman was a great annoyance to the Reformed ministers, and on one occasion they petitioned the Elector that he might order a prayer for the churches in which, in suitable language and without mentioning her name, the congregations might pray for the conversion of his wife "to the true religion." (According to a document in the secret archives in Berlin printed by Wangemann, pp. 40 to 43). Wangemann adds the remark: "Now the Lutheran country which was filled with indignation over the fact that officially the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper was called an abomination of papacy, should be compelled to pray that their 'Mother Anna' might become unfaithful to the Lutheran Church."

clared themselves willing to enter into such a union with the Reformed then the Lutherans of other cities would follow. Paul Gerhardt felt from the beginning the responsibility resting upon him and his colleagues. In order to understand the actions of Paul Gerhardt we must always keep in mind that a union was aimed at in which, as a matter of course, the Reformed had to sacrifice only their doctrines of predestination while the Lutherans were to give up all that Luther had emphasized over against Zwingli and Calvin. The individuality of Lutheranism was to be blotted out. On this policy the Great Elector was bent just as much as his grand-father Sigismund. He forbade the clergymen to subscribe to the Form of Concord; he forbade the students for the ministry to attend Lutheran universities in other dominions, and, as we remember, the university of Brandenburg in Frankfurt was Reformed; and the Lutherans were forbidden to publish anything except it had received the sanction of a board which was practically Reformed. In the edict of the great Elector to which the Lutheran ministers of Berlin had to express their obedience by signing that document ("reverse") it was also forbidden to abuse and to defame the opponent in the pulpit. Here we are accustomed to hear words of reproach against Paul Gerhardt and the Lutherans of his time. But can it really be proved that the Lutherans in Brandenburg did indulge in such manners in the pulpit? Wangemann writes: "The edicts of Sigismund and the Great Elector which all speak so boldly of the reviling and defaming and slandering in the pulpit are no proof that such accusations against the Lutherans were true." (Pp. 39, 40). The Reformed were very sensitive. Here an illustration: The colleague of Paul Gerhardt, Reinhardt, once, in a private letter, had called pastor Buntebart a Syncretist. Because of this he was called to account and a motion was made by the Elector's court-preacher to exile the evildoer. (Wang. 157). Wangemann having access to the best historical material preserved in the secret archives in Berlin has given a careful study to this subject and he emphasizes again and again that this reviling had been attempted only by a few who always

were promptly punished and, as a rule, were driven out of the country, and he deplores that so many historians have been misled by these edicts to believe the accusations, and that it has not occurred to them that they only show what influence the Reformed court preachers had with the electors as informers against the Lutheran ministers. (For further proof see Schultz, p. 423; Langb. p. 135). True the nearby University of Wittenberg, especially Hutter, under the protection of the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, conducted a relentless war against the church policy of Brandenburg; but the language that was heard from there should not have been charged to the subjects of the Great Elector. And even if some forget themselves for a moment, we must remember that the Lutherans also had feelings which were deeply offended when they saw that the most sacred articles of their faith were called heathen superstition and leaven of the Pope and when the rights of the Lutheran Church were trampled under foot. But as has been stated such strong language was only heard in exceptional cases. And especially the congregation of Paul Gerhardt has testified again and again that its pastor never had been heard abusing the Reformed Church. But the worst in the edict was the decree forbidding the ministers, in their sermons, to draw the conclusions from the teachings of their opponents, conclusions which up to this day are considered legitimate in all text-books of symbolics and church history. Now we come back to the question that caused us to take this retrospective glance over the preceding history. Could the Lutheran ministers of Berlin, without wounding their conscience, promise, by signing the "reverse," to obey the decree of the Great Elector? Stahl answers this question with the following words: "It was in itself against their duty as shepherds of the congregations not to be permitted to use the theological means in order to instruct their people of the errors surrounding them, and it was doubly so under the existing circumstances where the sovereign used all his power to discredit the distinctive doctrines of Lutheranism. This was a time when a thorough instruction and powerful exhortation was especially needed.

Therefore conscientious ministers, no matter how irenic they might be, could not obey the decree. Among them, Stahl closes, shines through all ages as an example of faithfulness Paul Gerhardt, the first of all Lutheran hymn-writers." (*Luth. Kirche und Union*, p. 47).

On the sixth of February, 1666, Paul Gerhardt appeared, by special order of the Great Elector, before the Consistory that he might declare whether he would sign the "reverse." In case he had not reached a decision yet, another week for consideration should be granted him. But Gerhardt declared that he needed no longer time, he had thought over the matter carefully, his conscience did not permit him to sign the "reverse." Upon this the Consistory announced that in case he should persist in his refusal, his pulpit was vacant. But the persecutors of the Lutherans had not taken into account the excitement which the removal of a man like Paul Gerhardt would cause in his congregation, in the whole city and even in the country at large. His beautiful hymns were sung in all parts of Germany, and in his congregation he was loved and esteemed beyond measure. Immediately the aldermen of Berlin and the representatives of the guilds or corporations assembled in a meeting where they framed and signed a petition to the magistrate as the patron of the Lutheran Church in the city asking the same to plead with the Elector that he might restore Paul Gerhardt. (Document produced by Langbecker, p. 157). The magistrate was only too glad to intercede. On the 13th of February a memorial was sent to the Elector in which it was emphasized that Paul Gerhardt had never abused the religion of his sovereign and that his discharge would meet the disapproval of the Protestants throughout the German countries. (Langb. p. 162). But this document was received with great disfavor, and in the reply even the piety of Paul Gerhardt was called into question, an evidence that the court preachers had succeeded in discrediting him. The determination of the Great Elector remained unshaken; Gerhardt had to sign the "reverse," or steps had to be taken to call a successor. When the negative reply became known in the city the people were,

for the first moments, disconcerted and confused; but quickly they assembled and after thorough consultation they decided unanimously again to ask the magistrate to petition the Elector urging him to restore Paul Gerhardt. The document in which they addressed the magistrate shows the great agitation of their soul. They expressed their sore distress that their faithful pastors are so taken from them. It was, they said, in no way the intention of their ministers to defame and revile, they would simply have the right to characterize erroneous doctrines as such, if circumstances and conscience should demand it. They petitioned and urged their sovereign to abstain from requiring something of their ministers that they could not do without wounding their conscience. The document was signed by the representatives of all guilds, trades, and corporations of Berlin, even their seals affixed to it, and again the magistrate accompanied it with most emphatic solicitations. (Langb. p. 164 ff., 168 ff.). But the tone of this address was felt by the Elector to be rebellious and he was moved with indignation. He did not answer personally any more, but replied through his minister, (Otto V. Schwerin), that the petitioners had not originated such language, they had been instigated by some revolting spirits, the author of the document would be found and duly punished. The magistrate was ordered in the future to decline such unbefitting petitions and instead of it admonish the pastors to sign the "reverse" (Langb. 170-175). We can imagine how the people felt when the reply became known in the city. The way to the heart of their sovereign was cut off. But nevertheless they sent another address to the magistrate in which they at least wanted to justify the content of their former petition. It touches our hearts when we see them writing as follows: "Our gracious lord and Elector says that we shall attend to our trades and not to the decrees. But dear, dear God, we must be concerned about the salvation of our souls. We believe that the way to salvation is shown us in our Lutheran confessions. Therefore it must be our duty to watch over such faith. When our ministers say that their conscience does not permit them to sign the "reverse" and they are removed be-

cause of it and others are called who do sign, what effect must this have upon the congregation? It will cause the most serious confusion. We would go to church with doubts as to the honesty and reliability of our preachers and our religion would suffer. We renew therefore our petition with diligence, and ask that the interests of the Lutheran Church be taken care of, that Paul Gerhardt be restored, and that our other ministers be not troubled with signing the 'reverse.' " (Langb. pp. 806, 807). But the magistrate could not risk to send this document to the Elector. At this moment of perplexity God himself came to the aid. The matter was taken up by the representatives of the country. These gentlemen were yet in the position to speak a serious word with the Elector. They had heard of Paul Gerhardt's removal, of the petitions, and of the refusals, and they considered it their duty to intercede. In very emphatic language, to which the Elector was unaccustomed, they sent him a communication on the 17th of July, 1666. In this they declared that the "reverse" was offensive, because neither the Augsburg Confession nor Luther's Catechism was mentioned, and it looked as if a union of Lutherans and Reformed was intended, which was not advisable. A true Lutheran could not sign such "reverse," and so far as the godly and irenic Paul Gerhardt was concerned there was no cause for binding him by an obligation. They therefore asked the Elector to restore him to his office and thus to calm the excitement in the congregation. (Langb. pp. 175-184). The Great Elector took a half year to consider, but then, in an order of January 9th, the following year, he solved the difficulty by restoring Paul Gerhardt without signing the "reverse." He communicated it to the magistrate, but besides this official communication he sent his own secretary to Paul Gerhardt informing him of his decision. This event was an occasion of great joy in the city. But while all were rejoicing, Paul Gerhardt felt depressed. The special delegate of the Great Elector had told him that the policy must be the gradual union of the Lutherans with the Reformed; therefore the edict would remain in full force and that it was expected that Paul Gerhardt would

obey the edict without signing the "reverse." So he saw that he was yet under obligation, under moral obligation to obey something which his conscience had not permitted him to promise by signing the "reverse." And he soon decided in his mind that, considering the whole situation, he could assume his office only if he were permitted to accept the Form of Concord. For under existing circumstances where the government was working to blot out Lutheranism he considered the Form of Concord an indespensable bulwark. We receive an impression of the tenderness of his conscience when he writes, on January 19th, 1667, to the magistrate: "I know by the grace of God who hath permitted me to work in his vineyard what anxieties the work in the congregation brings to the minister who wants to be true and faithful; if I now should add to this a gnawing worm of conscience, I would be the most unfortunate creature upon earth." (Langb. p. 190). And to the Elector he wrote that he had for fear of wounding his conscience not been able to sign the "reverse;" if he now should take upon himself a moral obligation, after God had given him strength to withstand so long, he would commit a sin that would trouble him all through life. (Langb. p. 196). It seemed that Paul Gerhardt had hoped that the Elector could release him from submission to the edict. But this was impossible for a sovereign. His efforts to bring about a union had already gone too far. And the tolerance of such an exception would seem as an injustice to the others. So Frederick William simply wrote to the magistrate, that inasmuch as Paul Gerhardt does not see his way clear to accept his restoration, a successor should be called. Now efforts were made by the magistrate, by the congregation, and by personal friends to persuade Paul Gerhardt to yield and to accept. Even the wife of the Elector sent her secretary to tell him that his restoration was unconditional, and it even appears from a document in the secret archives (Wangemann pp. 205-220) that the Elector himself sent a man of position—Paul Gerhardt would never give the name of this person—to discuss with him the situation. But on such occasions Paul Gerhardt would always see

that the policy of the government was to continue the old course. Now something occurred that was unexpected by all. On the 6th of June, 1667, the Great Elector revoked his decree in respect to the "reverse" that had caused so much bad feeling. (Schultz p. 144). Wangemann writes: "I could not find in the archives what moved the Elector to take this step. Perhaps it was a last wish of his dying wife, who was called home twelve days after this order was given." (p. 205). The edict, of course, remained in force and in it the ministers were deprived of the liberty to make use of legitimate theological means to show up the errors of a movement the program of which was the gradual annihilation of the Lutheran Church. And therefore Paul Gerhardt saw only one way before him, namely to lay down for good his work in Berlin.

Thus ends this story. It is very interesting. First, because it gives us an impression of the persistency with which the Hohenzollerns, from the time of Sigismund on, have worked to effect a union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Their ideals have never been realized in the manner they were intended, even not by Frederick William III. (See my treatise in *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* of 1903, pp. 67-89); but they have disseminated a spirit of indifference towards the distinguishing doctrines of the two churches, and with the co-operation of other forces (Liberalism in theology, Pietism) they have put a unionistic stamp upon so many movements of German Protestantism. And this story is very interesting because it shows us how the conscience of one of the noblest sons of the Lutheran Church moved in those struggles. Paul Gerhardt, this godly and irenic man, who, instead of defaming the suppressors of his church, would be found upon his knees bringing before God the troubles of Zion, was, by Providence, intended to be an unimpeachable witness to the fact that the opposition to the church policy of the Great Elector was justified.

But before we close our little biography, we would like to hear how this faithful servant of God spent his life after he had left his congregation in Berlin. From what we have already learned in the review given we have noticed that it is a legend

which has been universally believed to be historical truth that Paul Gerhardt, after he was removed from his office, had to leave Berlin inside of twenty-four hours, and that he in this situation, for the comfort of his worrying wife, composed his beautiful hymn *Befiehl du deine Wege* (commit thou all thy griefs). Between the sentence over Paul Gerhardt and his departure from Berlin, there lies a period of more than three years, and his wife died in Berlin. He did not suffer want, for his many friends cared for him, and the Duke of Merseburg had asked the permission to pay him a salary. Yet notwithstanding he was well up in age he desired a new field of labor. Such he found in Luebben in the Duchy of Saxony-Merseburg where he, in May 1669, was called as pastor. In the midst of this congregation he was permitted to serve his master seven more years. When he felt his end approaching he was worried that he had to leave his only son before his education was completed. He therefore prepared a last will with admonitions which might direct him on the path of righteousness. Because this will is very characteristic of the piety of Paul Gerhardt, we will give it here in full: "Since I have now reached the seventieth year of my age and have the joyful hope that my dear God will soon take me home and lead me into a better life than I have had upon earth I thank him for all the goodness and mercy which he has shown to me from childhood up. I pray from the depth of my heart that he, when my last moments come, may receive my soul and give to my body a blessed rest in the grave and that on the day of judgment he may raise me and all my beloved ones that I may see face to face my dear Lord Jesus in whom I have believed. I do not leave to my son many of the riches of this world, but I leave him an honest name of which he will not have to be ashamed. My son knows that I have promised him from his childhood up to God that he might become a minister of the Gospel. This he shall keep as a goal before him and not waver even if he knows that the ministry does not bring him many good days. God knows how to help and he can reward the tribulations with joy of heart and gladness of spirit. Be careful to study the sacred

theology in pure schools and in unadulterated universities, and beware of Syncretists, for they seek the things that are temporal, and are neither true to God nor men. Flee vile associations and follow the will and command of God. Especially 1) never commit anything bad, thinking that it will remain secret, for nothing is hidden that shall not come to light. 2) Be on the guard against anger, if the temptation comes, be silent and do not say one word until you have repeated the ten commandments and the Apostle's Creed. 3) Be ashamed of the sinful lusts of the flesh, and if the time comes that you can marry do it by calling upon God and with the counsel of pious, faithful and sensible men. Do good unto others even if they can not repay, for the Creator of heaven and earth already rewarded you when he gave unto you his Son in holy baptism and accepted you as his child and as an heir of salvation. 5) Flee all covetousness as hell itself, and be contented with what you have rightly earned, even if it is not very much. And if it should please God to give you plenty, pray him that he may keep you from making wrong use of it. At last, pray incessantly, study diligently, live peacefully, serve uprightly, persevere in faith and in professing Christ, then your departure from this world shall surely be a happy and a joyful event. Amen." (Langb. p. 226).

In his dying moments he derived the comfort for his soul from a beautiful verse of his own poetry when he said :

Kann uns doch kein Tod nicht toeten.
Sondern reisst Unsern Geist
Aus viel tausend Noeten.
Schliesst das Tor der bittern Leiden
Und macht Bahn, Dass man kann
Geh'n zu Himmels Freuden.

It was on the seventh day of June, 1676, in his sixty-ninth year when this faithful servant closed his weary eyes to awake at the throne of his Master to receive his reward.

ARTICLE IV.

BABYLONIA, GLIMPSES OF ITS CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE.

(CONTINUED FROM THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, JAN., 1906, pp. 60 ff.).

BY PROFESSOR KARL JOSEF GRIMM, PH.D.

The Babylonian prayers to a large degree display a special interest in the fate of the kings. Upon their well-being the welfare of the entire country depended. If the gods were well-disposed toward the ruler the whole nation was the gainer.

The Babylonian was not only a believer in gods; he also believed in demons, spirits, witches, and other powers as affecting the life of a man. The wide prevalence of this belief may be seen in the fact that a very large portion of the religious literature of the Babylonians consists in prayers and incantations against the evil spirits. Everything in nature seems to have had its spirits, good or bad. The spirit of the south-west wind, carrying with it disease and death, was a terror to the Babylonian. Similarly the spirit of the inundating river was feared as malignant and harmful, desolating the land and destroying property. A hymn * tells us of an eclipse of the moon being caused by an attack of seven evil spirits upon the moon-god Sin. These seven spirits are exceedingly powerful. We read of them :

Seven are they, they are seven,
In the subterranean deep they are seven,
Perched (?) in the sky they are seven.
In the subterranean deep they were reared.
They are neither male nor female ;
They have no wife, nor do they beget offspring.
They are destructive stormwinds.
Compassion and mercy they do not know,
Prayer and supplication they do not hear ;
Horses bred on the mountain are they,
Hostile to Ea † are they,
Powerful like the gods are they,

* See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January, 1906, p. 76.

† See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January, 1906, p. 73.

To work mischief in the street they settle themselves in the
[highway.
Evil are they, they are evil.
Seven are they, they are seven,
Seven, and again seven are they.

But however powerful they may be, they have no place in the ranks of the gods :

Among the gods their couch they have not.

Being thus surrounded by gods and spirits, good and bad, it was of the utmost importance to establish proper relations with these powers, to propitiate them if offended or evil, if good, to endeavor to make them serve him. Religious services, therefore, were constantly carried on. There were services during night as well as during day. Every day sacrifices were offered up. Fasts and festivals filled up each month of the year. One day in the year a special festival was celebrated in honor of a god or goddess. On such a day the people came from all parts of the district where the cult was celebrated to pay special homage to the deity. A very festive day was New-year's-day, celebrated on the 8th of Nisan (March–April) as the festival of Spring. Marduk, the local god of Babylon and chief of the Babylonian pantheon, was the hero of the day. The festival brought worshippers from all Babylonia to the capital. Nabu, the god of writing and patron of agriculture and science, was carried from his city Borsippa to Babylon in a magnificent ship, along a broad and handsomely paved street, to pay a visit to his father Marduk.* On such festival days in addition to sacrifices with purificatory rites to placate the gods or fore-stall their displeasure tales and myths telling of the deeds of the gods were recited, accompanied, it may be conjectured, in some instances by dramatic representations. From time to time extraordinary days of public humiliation and thanksgiving were ordered by the king to be observed. This was generally done when some political crisis or danger was at hand. The Babylonians appear also to have had a Sabbath.†

The chief places of worship were the temples. These were

* Cf. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1906, pp. 70, 71.

† Cf. also below, p. 383.

built and adorned in a most magnificent manner. They were erected on ground that had been consecrated by libations of wine, oil, and honey, and were square or rectangular buildings enclosing an open court on the side of which was a tower, built in successive stages. The image of the god or goddess stood in the innermost shrine of the temple. Here stood also the table on which the show-bread was laid. In the cuneiform ritual tablets it is stated that one or three or six dozens of unleavened cakes are to be laid on a sacrificial table before the deity. There was also a shrine called "the seat of the oracles"; from it oracles were delivered by the god to the officiating priests. The temple appears also to have had its outer court with an altar and a bronze basin for purificatory purposes.

The sanctuaries were the recipients of innumerable gifts, comprising images of gods, elaborate presents of gold, silver, precious stones, costly wood, and fine garments as votive offerings to the deity. These presents were used in the decoration of the temple and shrine as well as of the statue of the god, or as direct contributions to the temple-treasury. Often costly garments embroidered with gold and studded with precious stones were hung on the images of the gods. Votive tablets of lapis lazuli, agate, turquoise, gold, silver, and other metals with dedicatory inscriptions were deposited in the temples. Celebrations of victories were chosen as particularly appropriate occasions for making such offerings. In time the temples became enormously rich and great business corporations, controlling a large part of commerce.

In the more important religious centers the temples had archives containing the records of the administration of the temples and of their business affairs, including official correspondence and business letters. In addition to temple records business documents of a private character such as contracts, deeds, wills, marriage-settlements, and the like, were deposited in the temple archives.

Besides acting as official record-offices temples also had schools attached to them for the education of priests and scribes. In these schools the outfit for instruction in writing,

reading, mathematics and astronomy was kept; lists of signs, syllabaries, exercises, grammatical paradigms, mathematical tables, copies of religious texts, commentaries to important texts, incantations, prayers, hymns, rituals, ceremonial regulations, and other material needed in the preparation of students to conduct the cult and to carry out the various functions entrusted to the priesthood.

The priest's functions were mainly twofold. He assisted as scribe in drawing up legal documents and conducted the business affairs of the temple, and he officiated in the cult with its numerous ramifications, offering sacrifices, interpreting omens, exorcising demons. The priest was the proper intermediary between God and man.* He was essential for obtaining divine help against the mischievous workings of the spirits and witches. He held the secret that could secure freedom from ills and promote the welfare of every individual.

In course of time the priests became a closed guild or caste. No one was admitted who was not of priestly descent, of legitimate birth, clean-limbed, without any defects of the eyes, teeth or fingers; a member of the guild whose stature and form was not perfect, or who was suffering from a contagious skin disease, was unfit for priestly functions; he was still counted as one of the brethren of the craft, but not allowed to officiate as priest. The priests were married. They seem to have been organized in the form of a regular hierarchy. There were those who had charge of the sacrifices; there were the singers of the hymns and chanters of the ritual, the diviners, and the enchanters. There also was a high priest, and most probably each class of priests had its chief likewise. Frequent reference is made to women attached to the service of the temple. The revenues of the priesthood were derived partly from endowment, partly from voluntary and compulsory offerings. Tithes had to be paid by all classes of the people from the king downward, either in grain or its equivalent in money.

The language employed by the priests in their official acts, i.e. in their ritual prayers, their hymns, and various formulas, was not the vernacular of the country, but *Sumerian*, the lan-

* Cf. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Jan. 1906, p. 81.

guage of the pre-Semitic inhabitants of Mesopotamia, just as to-day Latin instead of the vernacular is used in the services of the Roman Catholic Church. As forms of worship we find the raising of hands and kneeling. At the offering up of sacrifices the priest would take the subject of the sacrifice by the hand and lead him up to the victim. The sacrificial animal had to be without blemish. As animals selected for sacrificial purposes the ox, the kid, the lamb, and especially the sheep are mentioned. Besides, fruits, vegetables, bread, wine, oil, salt, milk, butter, flour and spices were offered where no blood was required to be shed. So far we have no evidence of human sacrifice among the Babylonians. The offering of a great man was different from the offering of an humble man. There were both sin-offerings and heave-offerings. Cypress or cedar served as the wood for the burnt-offerings, which were kindled by a torch.

When the Babylonian, either for public or private purposes, desired to gain an insight into the future or wished to obtain a special advice from the gods in regard to an important act, he called upon the diviner. Sennacherib (705-681), for example, used diviners to discover the cause of the violent death of his father Sargon, and Esarhaddon (681-668) employed them when he was planning to rebuild Babylon.

Among the means of divination the inspection of animals, especially of the liver (hepatoscopy), stood preëminent. Besides, the will and plan of the gods could be seen in the visions of the night and in dreams, in the movements of the sun and the moon in the position of the planets, in the direction of the winds, in the formation of the clouds, in all possible experiences in man's daily life, in the unusual occurrences among men and animals, in the appearance and flight of birds, in the movements of the serpent, in the actions of the dogs, in monstrosities and birthmarks among men and animals. There were regular rites prescribed so as to secure the correct interpretation of the omens to be derived from the signs on the liver of the animals offered up whether as daily sacrifices or on festivals or other occasions. The priest had to be careful to put on the proper dress, to be free from all ritualistic im-

purity, and to speak the proper words. The question had to be carefully and precisely put in clearly pronounced words. He had to see to it that nothing improper might disturb the execution of the rite.

The enchanter or magician was the atoner and propitiator *par excellence*. He was called upon to pacify the angry deity, to propitiate for sins, and to drive out evil demons and witches. Regular ceremonies were prescribed for purging oneself from sin and contamination through evil spirits. A great many of the formulas of atoning and enchanting have been preserved. In one of them we read that a lamb is to be sacrificed at the gate of the palace, and that the blood of the lamb is to be put on the lintels and on the door-posts right and left. The enchanter stood in the service of Ea and Marduk. Occasionally the fire-god is addressed as in the following incantation:

Fire-god, thou mighty and lofty one of the gods,
Who dost overpower the wicked and the hostile,
Overpower them * that I be not destroyed.
Let, me, thy servant, live,
Let me stand unharmed before thee!
Thou art my god, thou art my lord,
Thou art my judge, thou art my helper,
Thou art my avenger.

The Babylonians believed that disease was a separate entity which might be produced by the displeasure of the gods † or by the malevolence of numberless evil spirits and demons, or by the influence of the stars and the changes of the moon. All these were capable of producing harmful effects upon mankind. To obviate the ill effects of these influences the gods must be appeased and induced to relax their displeasure, the evil spirit must be driven out, some influence must be brought to bear of sufficient power to drive away the disease and its cause. The enchanter and his science thus came to play a very prominent role in the life of the inhabitants of Babylonia. Symbolic magic especially was held in high esteem. Fire was a favorite agency for destroying the principle of disease in a symbolic manner. The enchanter

* The evil spirits or witches.

† Cf. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January, 1906, p. 81.

would cast into the fire of a brazier various objects and repeat over them the appropriate charm. As these objects were consumed by the flames, so, by virtue of the incantation, the fire destroyed the disease in the body of the patient. Water was likewise an element that played an important part, purifying baths and sprinkling with holy water being frequently mentioned in the magical tests :

Glittering water, pure water,
Holy water, resplendent water.
The water twice seven times may he bring,
May he make pure, may he make resplendent,
May the evil *rabisu* depart,
May he betake himself outside !

The water of the Euphrates or the sea was believed to possess peculiar efficacy, since all large bodies of water were under the special protection of the patron of occult science, the god Ea. A very common charm was connected with the tying and untying of knots in a cord, the cord symbolizing the spell with which the sufferer was bound. As the knot was untied, to the accompaniment of the proper formula of enchantment, the spell was loosed, and the patient was released of his trouble. An exorcism directed against witches runs as follows :

I, by the command of Marduk, the lord of charms,
By Marduk, the master of bewitchery,
Both the male and female witch,
As with ropes I will entwine,
As in a cage I will catch,
As with cords I will tie,
As in a net I will overpower,
As in a sling I will twist,
As a fabric I will tear.

The Babylonian enchanters also placed much reliance in the potency of numbers. The mystic number 7 was preëminent in this respect. In a calendar of lucky and unlucky days for the intercalary month of Elul (August-September) we read that the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st and 28th days of the month are unlucky. All these, as will be observed, are multiples of 7, except the 19th day ; but the exception is only apparent, for 19 added to the 30 days of the preceding month gives 49, the square of 7, and a number of special potency. On these

days "the shepherd of many nations * is not to eat meat roasted by the fire, nor any food prepared by the fire. The clothes of his body he is not to change, fine dress he is not to put on, sacrifices he is not to bring, nor is he to ride in his chariot. He is not to hold court, nor is the priest to seek an oracle for him in the holy of holies. The physician is not to be brought to the sickroom. The day is not suitable * * * ."

From the facts presented two things are clear: the enormous power and influence wielded by the priesthood, and the thorough control exercised by popular beliefs over the acts of the individual. The life of the Babylonian was spent in constant thought of gods and spirits who control all things in this world. He never lost sight of his dependence on powers unseen.

ARTICLE V.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. L. REED, M.D.^o

The family, in societies such as that of America, implies a husband and wife, or, in other words, a father and mother with their offspring. There is, indeed, and I think fortunately, a secondary sense in which the term is made to embrace, in addition, living progenitors and descendants, and an even broader meaning which takes in both antecedent generations and collateral branches. But it is the first signification, namely, that of parents and immediate progeny, that is accepted as the type of the family and that sociologists generally recognize in the terms of Mr. Lecky as "the center and archetype of society." When I say "generally" I speak advisedly, for there are others who agree with Sir Henry Maine, quoted approvingly by Mr. Spencer, to the effect that "the unit of an ancient society was the family, that of a modern society the individual." There is, indeed, a philosophic cult which has taken on decided political importance not only in Germany, France, and Italy, but the United States, one of whose central purposes is the development of individualism at the expense

**i. e.* the king.

of the family. But whichever of these views may be correct, either as a matter of fact or as a matter of principle—and I have no intention at this time to enter extensively into the dispute—it is certainly worth while that physicians who officiate at birth, who mitigate the pangs of death, and who are the daily defenders of the family against influences that threaten the existence of its members should consider the characteristics and relations of what, even in the present stage of evolution, must be recognized, at least in a biologic sense, as the primary group in our social complex.

THE TYPICAL AMERICAN FAMILY.

But in what sense are we justified in using the term "American family?" Has it an ethnic significance or merely geographic limitations? This brings us face to face with the rather persistent speculations about "typical America" and "typical Americans." It furthermore brings fresh to our mind that here in America we have many people of many lands, and that, as a result of their commingling, the corpuscles of one people, mingled with those of another, presently go coursing together through the natural gates and alleys of a lusty progeny. Has this blending gone on until its final product, the great ultimate composite, has been evolved? If so, where may he be found? If not—for the reply must certainly be in the negative—when may he be expected, and what will he look like and be like when once he is arrived? The answer to this double question may well be left to the curiosity of the speculative ethnologist, while we content ourselves with a few obvious facts. Thus, taking the sculpture and paintings of former ages as criteria, and comparing the human figure thus portrayed with the human figure as we now know it in life, we may safely assume that, after the lapse of similar ages of the future, the ultimate American, if he shall have then arrived, will look very much like his respectable progenitors whom we now see everywhere around us. Yet while this is true, we must recognize that Americans are acquiring, have indeed acquired, a certain stamp of individuality by which they can be recognized at a glance as Americans,

just as we recognize at a glance the German, the Frenchman or the Scandinavian, for what he is. Nobody who has traveled abroad can have escaped an experience or at least an observation confirmatory of this fact. The principle goes even farther—so far, indeed, that the natives of European countries who return for a visit to their native homes after several years spent in the United States are recognized by their physical appearance alone, and are spoken of as Americans by their former compatriots who may not know them personally. This change certainly cannot consist in any radical alteration, much less in eradication of the hereditary national stamp. Yet, possibly, in such instances the changes are of a character that, in a measure, may be reduced to terms. They become apparent when, returning from Europe, or, for that matter, when visiting Ellis Island, we study the physiognomies of the immigrants who have the spirit to resent the conditions with which they have found themselves enthralled and the enterprise to seek a broader and a better life in a fairer land. We then understand the change. We then see that, in the returning European, the garb of the peasant has disappeared in the genteel attire of the proprietor, the dependent air of the laborer has changed into the hopeful and confident bearing of the employer, while the stolid face of the social and political underling has disappeared in the cheery features of the freeman. Of such alchemy is our republic capable! But, particularly in the instance of native-born Americans, there is something more, something deeper than this, for there are cheery, well-dressed, hopeful, confident Europeans in abundance who are recognized as such at a glance. It follows, therefore, that some change is going on, something due to climate, habits, language, customs, habitations, food, and other factors that control and modify nutrition—something that reveals itself in facial expression, voice, bodily movements, and unconscious but more or less uniform mannerism, yet something that is too subtle for easy expression in words.

THE ULTIMATE AMERICAN THE TRUE ARYAN.

But whether our heads are getting longer or rounder, our cheekbones more or less prominent, our noses beaked or

pugged, our chins more prominent or receding, they are tendencies, if they exist, that likewise belong to the realm of speculative ethnology. It is a question of less practical importance to the American people than is the more significant fact that, with the exception of the Semitic element, our European immigration, although coming from practically every country, is in reality of common ethnic origin. It would seem, indeed, as if the three great primary branches, namely, the Graeco-Italian, the Celtic, and the Teuto-Slavic branches, through their many surviving ramifications, are again converging through multitudinous representations upon American soil, here to re-establish the Great Aryan branch of the human family in its purity. I say in its purity, for we observe that the blending of our blood with that of people so unlike us as the Mongol and the Ethiopian is repugnant to the very fundamental instincts of our race, and is consequently impossible. The only other dissimilar element of importance in our midst is the Semitic, and even that can claim an ethnic kinship in the fact that it as well as the Aryans belongs to the ruddy races. Furthermore, taken as we find them here today, the Semites adjust themselves, if slowly, yet faithfully and loyally, to the salient features, political and social, of the civilization that surrounds them, and even occasionally blend in marriage with their Aryan cousins. But such instances are of negligible infrequency, and consequently do not materially modify the fact that, even under such unprejudiced surroundings as obtain in America, the Semitic race is held in aloofness—remains a "peculiar people"—largely, no doubt, through the reciprocal exercise of those primary racial repulsions that today find their fiercest expression where the Slav and the Jew, the two most primitive representatives of the divergent branches of the human family, attempt to dwell together in a peace which in that area will probably never be realized. With these elements eliminated from the process of amalgamation now going on in America we shall discover that the blending does not involve the assimilation of fundamentally dissimilar elements. The slight divergence of type characteristic of national groups, those physical characteristics, for instance, that distinguish the

German from the Slav, the Englishman from the Celt, must be looked upon as so many accidents of travel, so many acquisitions of sojourn, so many fruits of experience. They mark little or no difference in the impulse toward civilization, although they may indicate a wider variation in the results achieved. But as these various peoples come together again after their long journey through the ages each will bring, as each is today bringing, his own contribution to the broadening civilization that is today, as it will continue to be, the increasing inheritance of the American family.

DOMINANT CHARACTERISTICS OF FUTURE AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

The future civilization of America, so far at least as its dominant characteristics are concerned, is probably less a matter of conjecture than is the exact balance of elements that will be represented in the final blend of the peoples. Here, again, the deductions of the future can be fairly drawn from the experiences of the past. Beginning, as our country did less than three centuries ago, with distinct groups of English, Dutch, French, and Spanish, and later with very large groups of Germans, our civilization in language and customs speedily became wholly English. We have since had infusions in groups of varying numbers from practically every country of Europe. As a matter of fact, the foreign-born population of the United States in 1900 was about ten and a-third millions, of which four millions, or 38.3 per cent., were derived from English-speaking countries. The remaining six and a-third millions have come from continental Europe, Germany alone furnishing a third of them. Of the original groups, those which comprised the original settlements, not one has stood out against the predominant influence of the English element. Of the remaining groups, or those which have been formed by later immigrations, when not too large or too definitely isolated, but few have resisted the great tide of American civilization for longer than a generation. And there is not today a single ethnic group of European origin, however large, however completely segregated from the distinctly American element, or however recently established, but that presents signs of active disintegration and assimilation. The public school,

with compulsory English, attendance upon which is enforced by law in many States, associated with the influence of the Church, the press, and active participation in political affairs, comprise an apparatus by which all foreign element are ultimately propelled into their appropriate place in the body politic. In this wise are we English, with every prospect that we shall remain English to the end. This is the condition as we see it today, and I, for one, know of no reason why it should be changed in principle and effect, however much it may be modified in detail, in the American civilization of the future.

THE QUESTION OF "RACE-SUICIDE."

But we no sooner begin to felicitate ourselves on the present and prospective results of the great ethnic experiment now being conducted in America, we no sooner begin to waive our salutations to the typical American, the proud Aryan of the future, than the statisticians tell us that the birth-rate of the country is declining, and publicists of exalted position and influence warn us that this splendid race, yet in its formative stage, is actually engaged in the act of self-destruction. It seems, indeed, as if in certain States in which the computation, based upon the census returns of 1900, is completed, the birth-rate is materially lower than it was 10 years previously—that is, there were fewer children born to each thousand of men and women (potential parents) between the ages of 15 and 45. This is true in spite of the fact that during the same period the actual number of births was several millions in excess of the deaths. So long as the balance is on the side of births as against deaths the race will continue to exist. We can readily imagine that with a progressive decline in the birth-rate the time, however remote, would come when the balance would be on the wrong side. The mere fact, however, that the rate of increase in population by reproduction vacillated from twenty-eight thirty-seconds of the whole increase in population in 1840 to fourteen twenty-fourths in 1890, with but little tendency to reaction in 1900, was due to the fact that the immigration in 1890 was almost ten-fold that of 1840. But if it were to be taken as an evidence of a declining ratio of births, a decline already indicated by the computations in sev-

eral States, the fact would be serious if it had no other than a mere birth and death significance and if similar tendencies did not exist in other peoples, so that the balance between nationalities will be approximately maintained.

Leaving the real significance of this movement of population for further consideration, I wish to particularize my last allusion. Thus marked declines are noted in Prussia, France, Sweden, Norway, with slighter decrease in England, while slight increase in birth-rate is noted in Belgium, Saxony, and Russia. France has been held up as an instance of a dying population, and it seemed, indeed, as if in 1900 the conclusion were justifiable, for in that year the recorded deaths exceeded the recorded births by nearly 26,000. This, however, was the culmination of a progressive decline, for in the succeeding year the pendulum was found to be swinging back, indicating that the surplus of births over deaths amounted to a little in excess of 72,000. But even this margin is an evidence of a stable population more nearly in a state of equilibration than any other in the world. Similar haltings, although less marked, have been noticed in other countries. Almost as marked a crisis was, however, reached in Belgium in 1817—a year of scarce food—followed by an immediate reaction. This same country again showed a steady decline from 1897 to 1900, but in the following year exhibited the largest preponderance of births over deaths in its history. A similar curve has been observed repeatedly in other countries, notably in Sweden. In the United States the percentage of increase by reproduction fell from 24.46 per cent. in 1860 to 15.38 per cent. in 1870, due, no doubt, to the Civil war, returning to 22.79 per cent. in 1880. Malthus gives numerous instances of the decline of birth-rate progressively with the increasing destiny of population in which reproduction returned again to its normal rate when either war, pestilence, actual famine, or migration had once reduced the congestion. It seems, therefore, that, whatever the cause of the declining birth-rate, the most marked depressions are followed by reactionary curves. Then, too, it is well enough to remember that, according to Duvillard, the span of life in the eighteenth century was 26 years, and that, according to

Lombard, it was 40 years during the nineteenth century, and that, according to present indications, it bids fair to go beyond 50 years before the end of the present century. It is also interesting, if not important, in the present connection to bear in mind that the population of Europe at the end of the fifteenth century was less than 48,002,000, and that it had increased to something over 350,000,000 at the end of the nineteenth century, or, in other words, that it had increased but about sevenfold in 400 years. Then associate this with the fact that between 1840 and 1900 alone the population of the United States jumped from a trifle over 17,000,000 to a little under 76,000,000, four-fifths of it being due to reproduction, or, in other words, the population of this country increased nearly fivefold in the short space of 60 years. Now associate all of these facts, and it would seem that the extinction of a people, particularly the American people, through either absolute involuntary loss of fecundity or the equally absolute but voluntary repression of reproduction, such as must be implied by the term "race-suicide," is a calamity the fancied imminence of which need not in the least disturb our dreams.

THE FECUNDITY OF AMERICAN WOMEN.

But it is urged that the decline in reproduction is chiefly with the native American woman, and that if the disparity continues to increase the continental people will become the dominant elements of our population, and that, as a consequence, our civilization will lose its distinctly Anglo-Saxon type. This observation is urged in face of the increasing stature, the improving physique of American women, in spite of the increasing frequency of the "Gibson girl" in the flesh as well as in fashion plates, and in spite of the fact that she is the distinctly evolved type of the American woman. Collective inquiry has, indeed, been made of our highest educational institutions for women to find out how many babies have been born by their graduates, with the inevitable result it was shown that relatively fewer children are born of cultivated American women than of the peasant women recently imported from Europe. The last census and the annual returns from American cities confirm the fact, which nobody has ever disputed.

As a result it is assumed and heralded that our civilization is exercising a deteriorating influence on the reproductive power, that culture is destructive of fecundity, and that, consequently, with the spread of education, with the increased diffusion of wealth and with the multiplication of luxuries, American women will no longer have the power to recruit the ranks of the race. It was precisely these conclusions, based upon precisely such an inquiry as I have indicated, that a few years ago were embraced in a paper by a distinguished American physician. And lest the news would not travel fast enough or far enough, the valuable document was translated into three other languages and published simultaneously in five leading countries. Yet the author of that paper, like many who have since been repeating his erroneous conclusions, began his deductions with a fatal error. This consisted in his misuse of the word fecundity, which, if it means anything, means the power to conceive and bear children. It was assumed by the writer in question that because native American women did not bear children in greater numbers they had lost the power to do so, when, as a matter of fact, known to every practicing physician in the country, as it ought to have been known to him, the average American woman does not have more children because she does not care to have them, and because her husband, for the most part, acquiesces in her view. Her reasons are not without force, and if reduced to the last analysis do not indicate a loss, but rather a development, if not an actual exaltation, of the maternal impulse. It is my opinion, based upon studious professional contact with precisely this phase of our social life during more than a quarter of a century, that the disinclination of American mothers to bear more children than they can properly educate and support is based upon an intelligent and conscientious regard of the rights and necessities of unconceived offspring rather than upon an aversion to the sacred office of motherhood. It is true that there are many women who prefer to be their husbands' mistresses rather than their wives, and who sustain the marital relation for mere sensual gratification to the exclusion of its physiologic consequences, but, in my opinion, they comprise but a small minority

of childless wives as compared with the considerate and self-denying women who think twice before they bring children into the world under unfit conditions. They feel, without knowing it, that, in effect, it is true in America, as Korosi shows that it is true in Buda-Pesth, that the span of life for the rich is 47, while that for the poor is but 32 years. And possibly they feel that the increasing complexity and consequent severer competition of modern life require that only the fittest shall be entered for the race. They recognize, subconsciously possibly, certainly not in definite terms, but they nevertheless recognize the force of the law enunciated by Mr. Spencer that "whatever conduces to the highest welfare of offspring must more and more establish itself, since children of inferior parents reared in inferior ways will ever be replaced by children of better parents reared in better ways." It follows, therefore, that the impulse, conscious or subconscious, of the American wives of today is to breed not more, but better children. They are Christians, with the consciousness of Christian duty toward their children, and, consequently, are far removed from the persuasive influence of the Koran, which offers paradise, just as some countries offer lands and money, to the father of 10 children, although I believe both the Mahomedan Church and the Christian governments resemble each other in their failure to bestow such bounties upon the mother who bears the brunt of the transaction. The American wives are, furthermore, members of a non-militant society, and consequently do not respond with enthusiasm to the call for children, however loud or however eloquent, when that call is based upon the sentiment embraced in the most brutal remark ever made by the First Napoleon, to the effect that the greatest woman in France was she who bore the greatest number of sons for the armies of France. Nor do they interpret the command to multiply and replenish the earth as an injunction to abandon themselves to an existence of unrestrained fecundity, particularly in view of the fact that the earth is already reasonably well replenished. They do, however, act upon the principle that by furnishing a less numerous but better-endowed, better-conditioned, better-equipped, in short a fitter progeny, they best furnish leaders

for a society that from its very nature is most in need of leadership. It is these considerations that force us to the conclusion that possibly the lessened birth-rate may work the salvation rather than the destruction of the distinctly American element in our population and of the distinctly Anglo-Saxon feature of our civilization.

THE DANGERS OF OVERPOPULATION.

It seems, indeed, to the careful student that the danger to the American family today and still more in the future lies in the direction of overpopulation rather than underpopulation. Our vast area, capable of sustaining a much larger population, makes it difficult to comprehend that the overpeopling of our land is destined to be a very practical, indeed, a very perplexing, problem in the not remote future. This becomes all the more difficult to comprehend when it is remembered that in 1890 the United Kingdom had 184, France 320, Belgium 530, and Italy 280, while the United States had only 20 people to the square mile. If, however, we turn from these figures to the rate of increase in the density of population we shall discover that for the 70 years from 1820 to 1890 it was, according to Mulhall, only about 25 per cent. in the United Kingdom and less than 100 per cent. in France, Belgium, and Italy, respectively, while it was over 650 per cent. for the same period in the United States. The rate of increase in this country has been vastly accelerated in the 15 years that have since elapsed. Take these in association with the additional facts that much of our great area cannot contribute to the sustentation of the people, and that our population, today over 80,000,000, has been doubling itself on an average of once in less than every 25 years since 1790, and that it will probably continue to do so in the future, and no vivid imagination, no prophetic vision, will be required to foresee the time not many generations hence when the family institution here will be subjected to the disintegrating socialistic influences that are today assailing it under pressure of overcrowding it in the countries of Europe. In the imminence of this contingency, which is no fancied one, a contingency which, while not menacing the race, does threaten society with calamitous disorganization—I say that, in the im-

minence of such changes, it becomes the duty of the medical profession, as the mentors of the people in all that concerns their well being, actively to foster those influences that will continue to make the family the unit and archetype of American society.

THE DUTY OF THE PHYSICIAN.

This duty on the part of the physician lies upon him at every point of contact not only with his clientele, but with society in general. Does an anxious mother consult him about the marriage of her daughter? The opportunity is at hand to teach the important lesson that while reproduction is by no means the sole object of marriage, no marriage is complete without it; that whatever other considerations may influence selection of a husband, his presumptive desirability as the father of prospective children should have a governing force in the final choice. These are, indeed, practical questions upon which the influence of the medical profession may well be sought. Does a young wife ask for a safe means to evade for a time the usual results of the marital relation? The occasion has arrived for a lesson in sexual hygiene by which the health of herself and of the offspring she may bear under more auspicious conditions may be properly conserved. Does another wife, more shameless, seek a means to destroy a conception already begun? The time has come not only to say "no" but to make the misguided woman conscious of the enormity of her offence. Happily, following the advent of the more or less hygienic measures for the prevention of conception, there has been a progressive decline in the vicious and disastrous practice of abortion. This crime, tolerated in antiquity, was permitted by all pagan societies. Aristotle, indeed, went so far as to insist that it should be enforced by law when population had reached certain assigned limits. There was no law against it in Greece, none in Rome under the republic, nor indeed until the latter days of the empire. Christianity, however, at its very advent issued its mandates, clear and ringing, against the crime, and stringent legislation against it ensued in every Christian country. Against this practice yet all too prevalent, a practice which not only destroys the life of the

innocent unborn, but frequently that of the mother, generally destroying her health and her fecundity when she does survive it, the medical profession has always exerted, as it will always continue to exert, its beneficent influence. But such opportunities should be utilized by the conscientious physician as an opportunity to teach the potential mother how, in the event of conception, she may realize the best results for herself, her offspring, and society. She should be told how to care for herself physically before and during pregnancy, so that she may have a healthy child, and how, by mental occupation and the cultivation of high ideals, she may supply her prospective offspring with formative corpuscles laden with the elements of useful character. She should be taught how to rear her offspring that it may be strong and healthy, able to bear its share of burdens in the great republic.

THE ENEMIES OF THE FAMILY.

But these instances are individual, and while the lessons taught may be all the more effective for that reason, there still remain many other questions upon which the physician should teach the community as a whole. Thus he ought, for instance, to recognize and, as occasion offers, teach that an enemy of the home is to be found in every influence that favors the early and wide dispersion of its members. The disintegration of religious ties, the development of residential schools, the rapid extension of far-reaching transportation facilities, the diversification of industries, the industrial employment of women, the formation of distinct industrial groups, the character of our political parties, the popularization of hotels and apartments for residential purposes, and, finally, the development of clubs for both men and women at the expense of the home are so many influences that are inimical to the American family, particularly in its broader and more comprehensive sense. Each of these topics could serve as the theme of a discourse. I only mention them that they may be taken into account as actual conditions, not all of them bad in their general effect, the majority of them being necessary incidents of evolving civilization, but still conditions the influence of which tend to disperse the family by diversifying and shattering the interests of its

members. Their tendency is to disintegrate the family ties, establishing first extreme individualism, with the re-establishment of the social relations under communistic conditions. The logical outcome of such reactionary tendencies was exemplified in the establishment of Oneida and similar communities that by their early and disastrous failure have acted as danger signals which I believe it is our duty, as occasion offers, to interpret for the protection of the family institution. It is not assumed that these various conditions, comprising, as they do, the dominant characteristics of our modern life, are to be changed, but something may be done to fortify the family against their encroachment.

THE SOCIAL EVIL.

There is, however, one other subject that appeals with greater force to the medical profession, if only for the reason that medical men, in their professional capacity, come daily in contact with its ravages. I allude to the social evil. My views on this question, and the views that I believe ought to be instilled by the medical profession into society, are expressed with great precision by Mr. Lecky, by whom "it is argued that, however persistently society may ignore this form of vice, it exists nevertheless, and on the most gigantic scale, and that evil rarely assumes such inveterate and perverting forms as when it is shrouded in obscurity and veiled by a hypocritical appearance of unconsciousness. The existence in England of certainly not less than 50,000 unhappy women, sunk in the very lowest depths of vice and misery, shows sufficiently what an appalling amount of moral evil is festering uncontrolled, undiscussed, and unalleviated under the fair surface of a decorous society. In the eyes of every physician, and, indeed, in the eyes of most continental writers who have averted to the subject, no other feature of English life appears so infamous as the fact that an epidemic, which is one of the most dreadful now existing among mankind, which communicates itself from the guilty husband to the innocent wife, and even transmits its taint to her offspring, and which the experience of other nations conclusively proves may be vastly diminished, should be suffered to rage unchecked because the legislature refuses to take

official cognizance of its existence or proper sanitary measures for its repression. If the terrible censure which English public opinion passes upon every instance of female frailty in some degree diminishes the number, it does not prevent such instances from being extremely numerous, and it immeasurably aggravates the suffering they produce. Acts which in other European countries would excite only a slight and transient emotion spread in England over a wide circle all the bitterness of unmitigated anguish; acts which naturally neither imply nor produce a total subversion of the moral feelings, and which in other countries are often followed by happy, virtuous, and affectionate lives, in England almost invariably lead to absolute ruin. Infanticide is greatly multiplied, and a vast proportion of those whose reputations and lives have been blasted by one momentary sin are hurled into the abyss of habitual prostitution—a condition which, owing to the sentence of public opinion and the neglect of legislators, is in no other country so hopelessly vicious or so irrevocable." None can gainsay that these eloquent words may be applied with equal severity to American conditions wherever and whenever they are controlled by maudlin sentimentality, that is too generally permitted to control the police policy of our states and municipalities.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN.

Physicians as students at short range of the social fabric unhesitatingly accept the dictum that the status of woman is the index of a civilization. This is shown throughout the ethnic scale from the procuring of wives by capture, then by purchase, through the intermediate stage in which American fortunes are traded for European titles, up to that exalted stage when the honest young American wooes and wins his neighbor's daughter and installs her in the home he has built for both within the shadow of the church and the schoolhouse. This is the type of home the purity of which is to be safeguarded by every sentiment and every material condition that can be thrown around it, just as in Rome at its height law and public opinion combined to make matrimonial purity the most absolute. In those times a Roman senator was censured for

indecency because he kissed his wife in public, a Roman mother was in disgrace who wilfully delegated the suckling of her young to another, and the courtesan class was regarded with such contempt that no member of it might ever touch the sacred altar of Juno, the goddess of marriage. It was only when Rome abandoned these standards that Rome fell. The same fact applies to Greece, whose glory departed when the wife was relegated to seclusion while the public women—the heterae—were given social recognition, when Phidias illustrated the Greek wife when he represented Aphrodite standing upon a tortoise, and when Thucydides said that the highest merit of a wife was never to be spoken of either for good or for evil. It was under these circumstances that many women who otherwise would have become wives chose rather to become courtesans, for of the women of Greece, save only Phocion's wife, it was the courtesans alone who figure in the annals of the country. We hear of Pericles and his Aspasia, of Socrates and his Diotoma, of Praxiteles and his Phryne, of Appeles and his Lois, of Epicurus and his Leontium, courtesans all, while their wives, married simply for breeding purposes, were relegated to the backroom of oblivion. It was in such an age and from such conditions that came the disintegration of the famous republic, just as the disintegration of Sparta had begun when the law decreed that old or infirm husbands should cede their young wives to younger men who could produce vigorous soldiers for the State. Tendencies equally disastrous in their disintegrating influence upon the family are already threatening to develop in our great commonwealth. Women, the products and exemplars of vice and crime, are today exploited into heroines by the press and the stage until the contagion of their example becomes virulent and active throughout the body politic. The harlot of yesterday married to the millionaire of today is all too likely to be received into certain otherwise respectable homes on tomorrow; the man reeking with disease, the product of vice, is all too likely to be accepted as an eligible husband if only he is the possessor of the wherewithal to purchase the weeds of an early and highly conventional widowhood. Courtesan and paramour, without

reference to their moral degradation or the physical consequences of their vice, are admitted without let or hindrance to the marriage relation. Then, tiring of each other, or seeing others more to their fancy, they get an accommodating court to dissolve the union, if for no other reason, on the statutory grounds of incompatibility, after which, seeking out a convenient magistrate or a complacent preacher, proceed to contract new alliances through which further to propagate their pernicious influence.

THE MENANCE OF THE DIVORCE COURT.

I have already said that the fall of Rome came when she had abandoned her high ideals of domestic virtue. It came, in fact, in the period of which Tertullian wrote that divorce was the first fruit of marriage, in which Martial gives the record of a woman who had her tenth husband, in which Juvenal tells of a woman with eight husbands in five years, while St. Jerome, as if not to be outdone by the others, gives the authenticated case of a woman married to her twenty third husband, she being twenty-first wife. It was in such an age that public opinion tolerated Cicero when he repudiated his wife, Terentia because he desired a new dowry, and Augustus when he took Livia from her husband by whom she was already pregnant, and Cato when he gave his wife to Hortensius, taking her back after his death, and Maecenas and Paulus Aemelius, and Sempronius Sophus, who changed their wives at will. Would not the annals of our own divorce courts reveal some almost parallel examples? Certainly the opportunities for such records are ample. There were more than twice as many divorces in Cook county, Illinois, in 1901 than were granted in all Belgium, while those in a half-dozen American cities exceed those granted in the whole of France for the same period. In Chicago there were 1808 granted in a single twelvemonth, being one to about every eight of marriages. In Cleveland, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Omaha the proportion was even higher, while in San Francisco there was one divorce for a little over every four marriages. In these figures and in the tendencies which they imply we discover what is probably the most for-

midable enemy of the American family, tendencies to combat which the medical profession should join hands with such representatives of the Church as are not too deeply interested in the pecuniary rewards of remarriages. There are many other influences in our social life that are antagonistic not only to the family, but remotely to the primacy of our race, but I cannot pause to discuss them in the time allotted for this address.

CONTRASTING IDEALS.

I ask, by the way of *résumé*, that you consider a few contrasting types of families as we find them represented in modern society—types that bear upon the question of reproduction and indirectly upon the maintenance of the family institution itself. The first picture is drawn by Gustav Frenssen, who opens his deservedly famous novel, "Jorn Uhl," with a portraiture of the unfortunate home spirit of German life—a portraiture so vivid, so faithful that certain of the great novelist's compatriots, while crowning his great novel as an epic, have reproached him for his merciless realism. The picture is, indeed, far from a pleasing one, portraying, as it does, a woman, delicate in mold, tender in sensibilities, the wife of a hardy and brusque farmer, who married her for mere breeding purposes, and to whom she has already born four children as the fruits of his insistent passion. She is seen in the midst of her fifth childbirth, in earshot of the thoughtless jeers of her elder offspring and the coarse and equally thoughtless revelry of her husband, who, wedded to his selfish pleasures, turns a deaf ear to her pleadings, until, to the consternation of all, her voice is stilled in death. There is even more to be seen in the background and the atmosphere with which the artist has deftly surrounded the tragic action. We see a state of society in which a wife is held as the mere breeder of children, in which fecundity knows none but natural limitations, and in which children, each at birth being another horse in the stable with which to divide the oats, are tolerated chiefly for the burdens they may ultimately lift from parental shoulders.

The next sketch represents a large Slavic settlement in Kansas, in which the village life of Russia is evidently as well exemplified as upon the far-away steppes. I clip the item as I found it in a newspaper a few days ago:

"In driving through Ellis county," says the correspondent, "one is not led to believe the people are prosperous from what one sees in the way of farm buildings. The houses are small, mere shacks. These dwellings, so unsightly from without, are also unattractive within—bare walls, bare floors, the cheapest of furniture. The housekeeper is in harmony with the surroundings. The wife has never known anything but the plainest living and hardest toil both in house and field. Every man, woman, and child old enough to drive a team toils in the field."

This, the correspondent further assures us, is probably the most fecund county in the United States, and one nidus from which we may reasonably expect the development of a peasant class, so long, happily, a stranger to our institutions.

The third sketch is that of the average American home, in which the wife is not only the companion of her husband, but the mother of such children as they feel they can properly support, educate, and place favorably in life. In such a home there is toil enough but it has its limit in the demands of the family circle for social enjoyment and at least elementary culture. The school, the newspaper, the magazine, the theater and the Church, each contributes its mite to the civilization that is rocked in the cradle of such a home. Here, under sanitary conditions, new lives develop with the best prospect of ample years in which successfully to meet the more complex competition, the fiercer conflict for existence, that awaits them in the future. It is these homes, in such families, to the preservation of which I invoke your assistance.

THE OUTLOOK.

But I do not mean to imply by all that I have said that the outlook is in the least dismal. So far as the race is concerned we have every reason to look forward to the re-establishment of the Aryan family on American soil as the most important

eventuation in the history of peoples, one already frightened with the largest fruition in the annals of mankind. Our civilization, Anglo-Saxon in genesis and character, the civilization that has brought into the world the largest share of human happiness by vouchsafing to mankind the largest share of human liberty, is already so well established that its reputation along present lines is already assured. We see in a declining birth-rate only a natural and evolutional adjustment of race to environment—an adjustment that insures rather than menaces the perpetuation of our kind under favoring condition. We see the family surviving and flourishing under more favoring conditions than were probably ever enjoyed by preceding generations and peoples, although menaced by influences which, if not corrected, threaten seriously to disturb the social order, through which the greatest progress and the greatest happiness have been achieved. The corrective tendencies are already operative, and consist, at least in part, in the more general diffusion of intelligence, in the development of industrialism, in the development of voluntary co-operation as opposed to involuntary co-operation, in the improving status of children, and in the fullest advancement of women within normal limitations. In lending aid to the operation of these forces we shall, I believe, be doing a good part in fostering that cornerstone of our society, the American family.

Ohio Medical College, Cincinnati.

ARTICLE VI.

PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN LUTHERANS AND HIGHER
EDUCATION.

BY REV. F. G. GOTWALD, D.D.

It must be kept in mind that the first German settlers in Pennsylvania were not Lutherans. Hence an investigation into our subject will find very little material during the first half century of German settlement in Pennsylvania. And even during the second fifty years materials are meagre and educational efforts are not extensive. The first full college established by the Lutherans in this country was not established until 1832, and these preliminary remarks are made so as to explain, in a general way, this educational inactivity for the first century of any considerable Lutheran population in Pennsylvania. We find that as a further explanation of this record of a century, several important facts should be kept in mind:

1. There was, first of all, the severe poverty of the Lutheran immigrants who first came. Many of them were "Redemptioners." There was, then, the great disadvantage of being badly scattered in location, and occupied by the strenuous efforts of the pioneers. In addition, there was the disadvantage of the foreign language, making it doubly difficult to conduct any educational work.

2. There were the distractions of the French and Indian War and of the Revolution, so that the first century was well occupied with acquiring homes, organizing Churches and elementary schools, acquiring another language, extending and protecting the frontiers of the white man's settlements, supporting and conducting the Revolutionary struggle for the establishment of a permanent government, and in doing all of those other necessary things which are the slow and costly steps in the process of effecting a great racial movement.

3. Another consideration is to be found in the fact that, for the greater part of this time, the pastors and parochial teachers

were largely furnished and qualified by the friends who remained in the Fatherland. Hence the immediate necessity of developing spiritual and intellectual leaders did not compel them to develop their educational system at this early period. Besides, the colleges of other settlers, who had the advantage of a much longer residence in the new country, were being established, and afforded opportunities for the particularly ambitious children of the German settlers.

But notwithstanding all of these considerations, it cannot but be felt that the Lutheran Church suffered much from this long-delayed forward step in the establishment of secondary schools and colleges on the part of the fathers. Undoubtedly great opportunities and advantages were lost and have never been recovered. Undoubtedly much strength was dissipated through lack of leadership and organization, which has never been regained. Yet we should not criticise the good fathers unjustly. Hence it might be in order to mention a few of the efforts toward educational advancement which were made especially during the latter part of the 18th century.

When, in 1743, Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg entered upon his pastoral work in Philadelphia, Providence and New Hanover, he at once founded parochial schools, teaching both German and English. As to the condition of the people at this time, he says : "I requested the congregation to send me here the older children, as I intend to go about among the three congregations, remaining in each successively one week. It does not look very promising to see youths seventeen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age appear with the A. B. C. book, yet I rejoice in seeing the desire to learn something. Singing has also totally died out among the young people." And so throughout his wonderful career as patriarch, organizer, and spiritual leader in the Lutheran Church of the 18th century in this country, this great man always combined the educational with the spiritual, and always emphasized the importance of the school as well as of the Church.

In 1754 he very heartily encouraged the efforts of the English "Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge" in estab-

lishing their schools throughout Pennsylvania. In this work Lutherans and Reformed united, and thus the so-called "charity schools" were established in 1755 at Providence, New Hanover, Vincent, Reading, Tulpehocken, Lancaster, York and other places. Rev. Michael Schlatter was appointed the inspector at a salary of 100£ sterling. The intention of these schools was "to instruct the youth in the English language and the common principles of the Christian religion and morality. The schoolmasters must understand both languages, German and English, and the proper persons must be found in the province." Although many of the German population did not take kindly to these charity schools, they were heartily endorsed and supported by Muhlenberg and other Lutheran leaders. But we hear no more of these schools after 1763.

Muhlenberg also had in mind, for a long time (1750-1760), the establishment of an orphanage and place for the preparation of young men for the ministerial office. Speaking, later (1775), of the desirability of a practical training school for Catechists and ministers in South Carolina, he used these words : "Oh, what an advantage and consolation an Institute would be, where Catechists could be prepared and made willing during week days to keep school, and on Sundays and Church festivals to deliver suitable sermons ! There would be no need to trouble these young men four years to study foreign languages. It would be quite sufficient if they were gifted with an average amount of good common sense, had a compendious knowledge of the essentials of theology, in addition to personal experience of the saving truth, if they could make a decent use of the pen, had command of their mother-tongue and the English; were also, to some extent, masters of the rudiments of Latin; of robust bodily frame, able to endure all sorts of victuals and weather; and, above all, if they were endowed with hearts sincerely loving the Savior, His lambs and sheep." These were his ideals, and to realize them were his constant efforts. Similar efforts were made by the Lutheran settlers in western Pennsylvania. The first school house in that part of the State was built by them in Westmoreland county in 1770,

where Balthasar Myer conducted his primitive school. Another such teacher was Johannes Stauch in Western Virginia.

Muhlenberg's plans were continued by the learned Dr. J. C. Kunze. "The plan of the latter was very comprehensive, as he laid the foundation of what *was to have been* a Lutheran College in Philadelphia, and which was in existence from 1773 to 1778. It was followed by the establishment of a German Department in the University of Pennsylvania, under Dr. Kunze from 1780 to 1784, and, after his removal to New York, under Dr. Helmuth. One of the inducements that called Dr. Kunze to New York was the prospect of a similar department in Columbia College, which would also comprehend a Professorship of Theology that he was to fill." The year in which Dr. Kunze went to New York, Revs. J. N. Kurtz, President, C. E. Schultze, Secretary, and H. E. Muhlenberg, a member, were elected from the Ministerium as trustees of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. At this time (1784) an effort was made by the Board of Trustees to secure the coöperation and contributions of the Ministerium, but it failed of result.

The next active step toward the foundation of a college was that taken by the Lutherans and Reformed in the organization of Franklin College at Lancaster. The Act of Incorporation of 1787 provided that the Board of Trustees should consist of 14 Lutherans, 14 Reformed, and 14 from other churches.

Among the first Lutheran Trustees were Drs. Helmuth and H. E. Muhlenberg, Revs. Kurtz, Schultze, Van Buskirk, Herbst, Melsheimer, and Gen. Peter Muhlenberg. The President was to be chosen alternately from the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. The purpose of the Institution was stated "to promote accurate knowledge of the German and English languages—also the learned languages—of Mathematics, Moral and Natural History, Divinity, and also such branches of literature as will tend to make men good and useful citizens."

The first President was Dr. Henry Ernst Muhlenberg. His inaugural, June 6, 1787, most forcibly shows the value of Christian ideals in education. His text was, "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and he asserted that

religious instruction was to be the main object to be kept in view in all of the instructions. Another distinguished Lutheran in the faculty was Rev. F. V. Melsheimer, sometimes called the Father of American Entomology, who had the Department of "Greek, Latin and German." There were 112 students in the English Department alone during the first year. Unfortunately the financial management was such that we find that it soon degenerated into little more than a local Academy, until, in 1850, funds accruing from the sale of lands (10,000 acres) in Western Pennsylvania, which had been given by the State, put the Institution upon a stronger financial basis. The share of the Lutherans (over \$17,000) was now transferred to found the Franklin Professorship in the Lutheran College at Gettysburg. The Lutheran Trustees of Franklin were also now transferred to the Board at Gettysburg, increasing the number to 36. This Franklin chair was filled from 1850 to 1883 by nominees of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, the body which had had part in the organization of Franklin College (named for Benjamin Franklin) in 1787.

One of the founders of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania (1748) was Rev. John Christopher Hartwig, who landed at Philadelphia in 1747, and at once became associated with Muhlenberg. Although Hartwig's pastoral labors were largely in New York State, along the Hudson, yet he always retained his connection with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and his close relations with Muhlenberg and the other leaders of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania. Our interest in this remarkable character is due to the fact that, through his will, he bequeathed a large tract of land, consisting of 21,000 acres, Otsego County, New York, with which to found an Institution for educating pastors and missionaries to the Indians. He died July 16, 1796, and named Drs. Kunze and Helmuth as Directors of the proposed Institution. Dr. Helmuth declining to serve, Dr. Kunze arranged for the opening of the Seminary in 1797. Thus was founded the *first distinctively Lutheran educational Institution in this country*. It consisted of the academic, classical and theological courses. The location was finally fixed

in 1812 when the buildings were begun. In 1815 Dr. E. L. Hazelius (from Pennsylvania) became Principal and Professor in Theology, with John A. Quitman, afterwards Governor of Mississippi, as his assistant. Dr. Kunze prepared an elaborate plan which he sent to Halle for consideration, and which he also laid before President Washington. But, unfortunately, these large plans for Hartwick Seminary were never realized. Much of the valuable land was lost through mismanagement, and the Institution today has the limited amount of only \$60,000 of productive endowment. Of this sum the Hartwig bequest amounted to \$20,000. Its property is also worth \$50,000. It now maintains an academic course and a theological course. The teachers in this historic Institution have been almost invariably of German Blood. Among such names we would mention Hazelius, Miller, Strobel, Hiller, Sternberg, Kistler, Pitcher and Traver.

During this period much private instruction and preparation for the ministry was given by many of the older and abler pastors. Drs. Helmuth, Schmidt, Geissenhainer, Sr., H. E. Muhlenberg, Endress, Goering, Lochman and J. G. Schmucker were eminent as private theological instructors. The Ministerium frequently designated pastors who were to be regarded as official theological preceptors. A little later, Drs. D. F. Schaeffer, of Frederick, Md., and S. S. Schmucker, of New Market, Va., also appeared.

This brings us to the first decades of the 19th century. At this time, the young people of the Lutheran Church were in attendance at the denominational and other colleges which had already come into existence. Columbia College, New York; the University of Pennsylvania; Dickinson College, Carlisle; Jefferson College, Cannonsburg, and other Institutions now had students and graduates in the Lutheran Churches and in her ministry. The Presbyterian Theological Seminary was established in 1812 at Princeton, N. J., and soon had Lutheran candidates among its students. The most distinguished of these was S. S. Schmucker, who was graduated in 1820. As before stated, he at once, in his first charge at New Market, Va., be-

came a preceptor for a number of candidates for the ministry. In 1822, he prepared the *Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Lutheran Church* for the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, which Formula was afterward adopted by the General Synod, and determined the organization and administration of its congregations and Synods, and indirectly had a far-reaching effect upon the Lutheran educational and missionary propaganda in this country.

At this time the movement toward organization and concentration of the Lutheran interests in this country was being considered. In 1818 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania resolved that "In its judgment, it would be well if the different Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States were to enter, in some way or other, in true union with one another," and appointed its officers to correspond with the other two Synods (New York and North Carolina) on the subject. In 1819, a preliminary plan to this end was adopted by the Ministerium at Baltimore by a vote of 40 to 8. The convention to adopt a constitution was then held at Hagerstown, Maryland, October 22, 1820. At this meeting, there were four Synods represented, with 11 clerical and 4 lay delegates, 8 from Pennsylvania and 7 from other Synods. The Constitution then adopted was later adopted by the Ministerium by an overwhelming vote of 67 to 6.

The thoroughly German character of this historic Convention in 1820 clearly appears from the names of those who composed it. From the Synod of Pennsylvania came Drs. Lochman (Geo.), Geissenhainer, Endress, Schmucker (J. G.) and Muhlenberg (H. A.), and Messrs. Christian Kunkel, William Hentzel and Peter Strickler. From the Synod of New York, Drs. Mayer and Schaeffer (F. C.), and from the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, Drs. Kurtz (J. D.), Schaeffer (D. F.) and Mr. G. Schryock.

All of this is recited because of its incalculable influence on the later educational developments among the Lutherans in this country. For one of the first acts of the newly organized body was to found a Theological institution, when, at its third

session, in 1825, it resolved "to forthwith commence in the name of the Triune God, and in humble dependence on His aid, the establishment of a Theological Seminary. In this Seminary shall be taught, in the English and German languages, the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession." Rev. S. S. Schmucker was made its first Professor, and continued in this position until 1864. Throughout his career, he was a most prominent leader in educational matters, both as a teacher, author, and organizer both in his own Church and throughout the entire country. The Professors in this seminary have been almost invariably Pennsylvania Germans, among whom have been Schmucker (S. S.), Hazellius, Schmidt (H. I.), Hay (C. A.), Krauth (C. P.), Schaeffer (C. F.), Valentine, Morris, Baugher (H. L.), Stork, Wolf, Richard, Billheimer, Singmaster, Kuhlman and Coover. This Theological Seminary now has assets of over \$400,000, and has graduated over 1,000 ministers and missionaries. Its chief benefactor has been Mr. Henry Singmaster, a Pennsylvania German.

The Institution at once developed the need of a collegiate institution for the proper preparation of candidates for the ministry. The Seminary had been located at Gettysburg on account of its then accessibility and because of a bonus (\$7,000) given by that town (in competition with Hagerstown and Carlisle), and thus the first Lutheran College was organized in the same place. Perhaps it should be stated in explanation of the fact that both of these Institutions were located west of the Susquehanna, and thus west of the Lutheran stronghold, at that time, in this country, that the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had withdrawn from the General Synod in 1823, and thus had no part in the locating of these institutions. Otherwise, it is probable that this collegiate and theological center would have been located in some Lutheran community east of Susquehanna.

We now come to the real beginnings of the first Lutheran College in this country, launched by Pennsylvania Germans. The Seminary having been started in 1826, it was soon found

that a large number of the students were deficient in preparation. "Accordingly, one of the first class, David Jacobs, a graduate of Jefferson College, Cannonsburg, Pa., was asked to open a Gymnasium or Academy. This he did with 2 pupils, June 25, 1827. But before the teacher who had begun the work could participate in the realization of a College, he had fallen, in November, 1830, at the age of 25, a sacrifice to his zeal and devotion to the cause." His brother, Michael Jacobs, D.D., was a beloved and scholarly teacher in the Gymnasium and College from 1829 to 1871. The beginning of the College was certainly a day of small things. This so-called Academy was opened, as we have stated, June 25, 1827. The building had been previously erected for a local school by means of an appropriation of \$2,000 made by the Legislature. In 1829, a Scientific Department was added. The course of study in the "Gettysburg Academy" was arranged for 5 years, beginning with the study of the Latin and Greek languages, its 3 years course being about parallel with the Freshman year of the College course. In September, 1829, the building which they had been using was sold by the Sheriff and purchased, in trust, by Professor Schmucker and others for educational purposes; they agreeing with the citizens to form "an association for the establishment of a classic and scientific department in subservience to the objects of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and for the purchase of the Adams County Academy." Thus the Institution was bought and placed under the care of the stockholders of this association. The original stock consisted of \$1,100 at \$50 per share. The stockholders were all Lutheran clergymen, and their names should be cherished as the founders of what proved to be *the first Lutheran College in America*: S. S. Schmucker, John Herbst, H. G. Stecher, J. G. Schmucker, C. F. Heyer, John Ruthrauff, Jacob Crigler, Emanuel Keller, Jacob Martin, J. W. Heim, Benjamin Kurtz, David F. Schaeffer, John G. Morris, Abraham Reck, Dr. Fr. Schaeffer, Michael Meyerhoeffer, Jacob Medtart, Lewis Eichelberger, C. Philip Krauth, W. G. Ernst, Daniel Gotwald and Charles F. Schaeffer.

Rev. David Jacobs having died in 1830, Rev. H. L. Baugher, a graduate of Dickinson College, which had been established in 1783, took charge in April, 1831. In the fall of 1831, under the leadership of Professor Schmucker of the Seminary, a meeting of prominent citizens was held to consider the question of the enlargement of the Gymnasium into a College. Plans were approved, and a committee appointed to visit Harrisburg and secure a charter for the new institution. Professor Schmucker spent several weeks at Harrisburg in making plans for the measure, and delivered an address before the Legislature on "The Eminent Character and Services of the Germans in Pennsylvania, and their Claims for Recognition by the Legislature." The charter was granted, April 7, 1832, and signed by a Pennsylvania German Governor, Wolf. It was compiled by Professor Schmucker from similar charters, and was written by him in the side room of the Senate. The charter specified that there *must always* be a German Professorship, an unusual provision for that day. Arrangements were now made for the organization of the College, July 4, 1832. Trustees were elected and the following faculty chosen: Rev. M. Jacobs was made Professor of Mathematics and Physical Sciences; Rev. H. L. Baugher, of Greek language and Belles Lettres. Professors Schmucker and Hazelius consented temporarily and gratuitously to assist in other branches, and Rev. J. A. Marsden was made Professor of Mineralogy and Botany. The usual college course of 4 years was adopted, with a preparatory course of 3 years. The College was opened, November 7, 1832. Dr. Hazelius retained his position for only one year, and then removed to South Carolina, and was succeeded, both in the Seminary and College, by Rev. C. P. Krauth.

At once the young Institution felt the great need of increased income. The increased number of students required new buildings, and a larger faculty. Hence Professor Schmucker, who was practically Acting-President at this time, again went to Harrisburg and vigorously urged the claims of this Lutheran College before the Legislature. Dickinson (1783), Washington (1806), Jefferson (1802), Allegheny

(1806), and Lafayette 1832, were also urging similar claims. Thus the contest was most spirited. By the aid of many friends, and particularly of Hon. Thaddeus Stevens (representing Adams County), an appropriation of \$3,000 a year for 6 years was granted, to begin June, 1834. At a later period (1838-45), the State gave \$1,000 per year for 6 1-2 years. Mr. Stevens was a Trustee of the College from 1834 until his death in 1868. With the financial encouragement thus afforded, it was determined to enlarge the faculty and to elect a President. Professor C. P. Krauth was then chosen first President of Pennsylvania College at the Spring meeting of the trustees in 1834. He was President until 1850. Professor H. J. Baugher, Sr., D.D., was President from 1850 to 1868; Professor M. Valentine, D.D. from 1868 to 1884; Rev. H. W. McKnight, D.D., from 1884 to 1904, and Professor S. G. Hefelbower, D.D., has been President since 1904. Among its most distinguished professors have been Drs. H. I. Schmidt, later for 33 years professor at Columbia University, Gen. Herman Haupt, the distinguished engineer, Drs. F. A. Muhlenberg, and S. P. Sadtler, later professors in the University of Pennsylvania.

During these 75 years of the history of Pennsylvania College, the Institution has acquired a property valued at \$250,000, a Library of 30,000 volumes, and an endowment of \$250,000. Its Funds have come from such Germans as Bittinger, Morris, Graeff, Ockershausen, Strong, and the Franklin and German Professorships (by the Pennsylvania Ministerium). Its Board of Directors is almost entirely composed of men of German ancestry. The attendance has been steadily growing until this year it has reached a total of 230 in the four college classes and 75 in the preparatory department. During these 75 years, 1300 have been graduated, and over 4000 have attended. In June of 1907, the 75th anniversary of this College, a monument to Pennsylvania Germans, was celebrated, at which time measures were inaugurated looking to the increased efficiency of the institution.

Ten years after Pennsylvania College was founded at Gettys-

burg, it was resolved by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio "to ordain and establish a Literary and Theological Institution" in Ohio. This Institution was incorporated, March 11, 1845, and was located at Springfield, Clark County, in Southwestern Ohio. The incorporators, as the names will show, were largely Pennsylvania Germans now settled in Ohio. They were John Hamilton, W. G. Keil, David Tullis, John B. Reck, John H. Hoffman, Jacob Roller, Elias Smith, P. N. O'Bannon, Solomon Ritz, George Leiter, John N. Kurtz, Philip Binkley, David Rosenmiller, Frederick Gebhart, Peter Baker and George Sill. It has been conducted ever since by the five District Synods of the Lutheran Church, covering the States of Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Michigan and most of its Trustees are of German stock. Its Presidents have *all* been of Pennsylvania German stock: namely, Ezra Keller, 1845-1849; Samuel Sprecher, 1849-1874; J. B. Helwig, 1874-1882; S. A. Ort, 1882-1900; J. M. Ruthrauff, 1900-1902; and C. G. Heckert, since 1902. Other Pennsylvania Germans who have been connected with the Institution as professors were: H. R. Geiger, Michael Diehl, F. W. Conrad, Isaac Sprecher, C. L. Ehrenfeld, S. F. Breckenridge, Edgar F. Smith, L. A. Gotwald, D. H. Bauslin and V. G. A. Tressler. During these 62 years, this Institution has accumulated property valued at over \$200,000, and a productive Endowment over \$300,000. The chief gifts for Endowment have come from such Germans as the names Weikert, Gebhart, Harter, Stroud and Hamma would indicate. Over 700 have been graduated from the College, and over 300 from the Theological Department. The attendance last year in all Departments was 386.

The next Lutheran educational undertaking was the founding of Capital University in Columbus, Ohio, in 1850. The Theological Seminary of the Ohio Synod had been in existence since 1830, and, as at Gettysburg, so here a Collegiate Department became a later necessity. During the Professorship of Dr. Shaeffer in 1843, delegates had been sent to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to secure its coöperation. Professors Lehmann, Reynolds (graduate of Jefferson College), Spielman,

Greenwald and Loy have been distinguished Pennsylvania Germans in the history of this important educational work at Columbus. This has had a dominant influence in the so-called Joint Synod of Ohio. This body has had a remarkably prosperous history, and is now considering union with the German Iowa Synod. In such an event, the Institution at Columbus would have a largely augmented power in the American Church, as the general body would then embrace over 200,000 communicants.

"Missionary Institute" was next founded at Selinsgrove, Snyder County, Pa., in 1858. It was founded largely through the efforts of Rev. Benjamin Kurtz, D.D. (grandson of Rev. J. N. Kurtz) with the special object of educating for the ministry men advanced in life. There were also theological differences with the teaching at Gettysburg which influenced Dr. Kurtz to organize the new school. Here a Preparatory Department and a complete collegiate course have been provided. A very useful work has been done, many valuable workers having been furnished to both Church and State. Over 200 have been sent forth into the ministry from this school. Among the leading German names associated with this educational work in the midst of Pennsylvania are those of Kurtz, Ziegler, Born, Dimm, Focht, Yutzy, Manhart and Aikens. Last year they had an attendance in all Departments of 224. It is governed by a Board of Directors, the great majority of whom are of Pennsylvania German stock. It has an Endowment and property worth at least \$200,000. It is now being conducted under the name of Susquehanna University.

In 1864 leaders of the Pennsylvania Ministerium brought about the organization of a new Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, with three Professors—Drs. C. F. Schaeffer, W. J. Mann and C. P. Krauth. Thus, 100 years after it had been first proposed, the project of Muhlenberg was at last realized. In the past 43 years this Seminary has accumulated an endowment of \$200,000, and a superb property at Mt. Airy. The new stone Library will cost \$100,000. Over 600 graduates have entered the Lutheran ministry. In

1866 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania (which had re entered the General Synod in 1853) dissolved its connection with the General Synod. It would not be in place here to recite the many causes which had led up to this dissolution.

At all events, further coöperation in Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg ceased, and the Ministerium founded a College, named after the great Patriarch, Muhlenberg College, in 1867, at Allentown, Pa., with Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg as its first President. This, therefore, was the next important educational effort on the part of Pennsylvania Germans in the very heart of the historical Pennsylvania German territory. Muhlenberg College has now had a history of 40 years, and has had a distinguished line of educators as its Presidents in Drs. Muhlenberg, Sadtler, Seip and Haas. A magnificent new plant on the outskirts of Allentown has been recently erected. Its trustees are elected by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, and, as might be expected, are entirely of German stock. The President of the Board of Directors is the Hon. G. A. Endlich, and the President of the College is Rev. J. A. W. Haas, D.D. During the current year, 1907, the total attendance in the College and Preparatory Department was 191. There have been 645 graduates, most of whom have entered the ministry.

In 1870 Carthage College, Carthage, Ill., was founded by General Synod Lutherans in that State. There had been a Western College established first at Hillsboro, and later, 1852, at Springfield, Ill. There were graduates from 1854 to 1865. The leading names in connection with this work were Drs. Springer, Harkey, Reynolds and Croll—all Pennsylvanians. Unfortunately this enterprise did not succeed, but it was the forerunner of another which has succeeded. In 1870, as stated, Carthage College, at Carthage, Ill., was organized by special commissioners of the Evangelical Lutheran Synods of Illinois and Iowa. Its first President was a Pennsylvania German, Dr. D. L. Tressler. The first class was graduated in 1875. Other Pennsylvania Germans have been its Presidents, namely, Drs. Kunkelman, Dysinger, Ruthrauff and Sigmund, the present incumbent. The present value of its campus, buildings and

furnishings is at least \$60,000, and the active Endowment is \$50,000. It has an offer, now, of gifts amounting to \$120,000, if \$100,000 be raised by the Church within the next year; in which event the productive endowment would be over \$250,000, and would make the Institution comparatively self-supporting. Its chief benefactor has been a German, Mr. Henry Denhart, of Washington, Ill. Carthage College has no Theological Department, but last year, in its College and special Departments, it enrolled 251. Over 250 have been graduated and over 5,000 enrolled.

During this same period, the Pennsylvania German Lutherans had been active in the Western part of their State in educational efforts. In 1866 an Academy was established through the generosity of a Pennsylvania German, namely, A. Louis Thiel, in Philipsburg, Beaver County, Pa. Its first Principal was Rev. E. F. Giese. In 1868 he was succeeded by Professor Henry Eyster Jacobs, who, for the past 40 years, has been a most influential teacher in the English Lutheran Church in this country. In 1870 he was succeeded by Rev. H. W. Roth. At this time, through a handsome bequest of Mr. Thiel (\$80,000), the Institution was enabled to be enlarged into a College, and removed to Greenville, Mercer county. During its entire history Thiel College has been under great obligations to Rev. W. A. Passavant, D.D., whose work for education and other philanthropies in the 19th century will give him rank with the other great organizer, Henry M. Muhlenberg, in the 18th century. Thiel College has been an important agency in the General Council division of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, and has furnished many candidates for the ministry. For the past three years, on account of litigation, it has been closed, but will reopen next fall at its old location to continue its important services. Its assets are \$150,000. Over 1,000 students have been enrolled.

At this point we should probably allude to the very considerable educational work of Pennsylvania Germans in the South. Roanoke College, Salem, Va., founded in 1853, is a "monument to the earnestness and untiring zeal of its first

President, Dr. D. F. Bittle. North Carolina College at Mt. Pleasant, N. Carolina, under the Presidency of his brother, Dr. D. H. Bittle, had made a promising beginning in 1858, when it was overtaken by the calamities of the Civil War."

Newberry College was incorporated in 1856. Its property was occupied by the Confederate Government, and rendered unfit for future use as a College. The Theological Seminary was also closed, to be reopened in 1892 with Dr. A. G. Voigt as Dean. Both Roanoke, Rev. Dr. J. A. Morehead, President, and Newberry, Rev. Dr. J. A. Scherer, President, have, during the past year, enjoyed the greatest prosperity of their history. The former enrolled 218 students and the latter 212. They both have finely equipped plants, most of the buildings being thoroughly modern. The former has assets of \$200,000; the latter \$125,000 with more in sight.

Among the distinguished Pennsylvania German teachers who have served in these institutions should be mentioned Drs. Hazelius, Stork (T.), Smeltzer, Eichelberger, Baughman, Stork (C. A.), Dosh, Dreher, Scherer and Voigt. Roanoke College was the only one of the Southern schools to remain open during the Civil War.

The General Synod of the Lutheran Church, of whose founding by Pennsylvania Germans in 1820 we have spoken, has always continued to be, predominantly, a Pennsylvania German body—three-fifths of its membership being yet found in Pennsylvania and Maryland. Hence the action of this body at Harrisburg in 1885 in founding a "Board of Education" "to render financial aid to educational institutions, and do such other things pertaining to and best calculated to promote the best interests of the Church," can properly be included in this account. The Board appointed in 1885 consisted of Revs. M. Rhodes, L. M. Heilman, T. F. Dornblaser, J. S. Detweiler, J. H. Culler, Messrs. Aug. Kountze, G. H. Maish and Robert Weidensall. It will be noticed that all are German and nearly all are Pennsylvania Germans.

During the past 22 years this Board has disbursed almost \$250,000 in carrying out its designs.

In 1887, it founded Midland College at Atchison, Kansas. This Institution does a most efficient work in that section of the country, having graduated 100 from the college course and over 200 from the academy and other departments. In these 20 years, over 1,000 young people have received educational training at this Institution. It has accumulated property, including endowment and buildings, amounting to \$115,000. The principal gifts of endowment have come from Rev. George D. Gotwald and Rev. Henry Heigard. Its two Presidents have been Drs. J. A. Clutz and M. F. Troxell, both Pennsylvania Germans.

Another of the important enterprises of the Sainted Dr. W. A. Passavant was the Chicago Theological Seminary, founded in 1891. It is in connection with District Synods of the General Council. It has prepared for the ministry over 200, and has greatly aided hundreds of others through post-graduate and correspondence courses. It has acquired a very valuable property, worth at least \$175,000 *and all within 15 years*. Rev. R. F. Weidner, D.D., has been its one President, and to him is largely due the remarkable career of this Western work. Dr. Weidner and the other three members of the faculty, Drs. Krauss, Gerberding and Ramsey, are all Pennsylvania Germans.

Another educational institution of a theological character is the Western Seminary of the General Synod, founded in 1895 by the Board of Education, and located at Atchison, Kansas. It includes a German Department, which is doing for the scattered Germans of the Middle West a work very similar to that of the pioneers throughout Pennsylvania 100 years ago. In its twelve years of history, the Western Seminary has graduated 62, and has given a partial course to fully as many more. The President, Dr. F. D. Altman, and the other English Professor, Dr. Dysinger, are both of Pennsylvania German Stock. The two Professors of the German Department came from Germany direct without any admixture of Pennsylvania German blood. Funds for Endowment and Scholarships amounting to \$20,000 have been accumulated.

Before closing, we should also allude to the educational work

in connection with Foreign Missions done by Pennsylvania Germans in the Lutheran Church. The foreign work of the Lutheran Church in this country was begun in India by Rev. C. F. Heyer, who was sent out by the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1841. There is now being conducted under this Mission, at Guntur, the magnificent Watts Memorial College, which last year enrolled 985 students, and which is presided over by a Pennsylvania German, Dr. L. B. Wolf. The India Mission work of the General Council at Rajahmundry is being conducted by Dr. J. H. Harpster, also of Pennsylvania.

Another important enterprise of a distinctly educational character is the Deaconess work. This was introduced in this country by Dr. Passavant in 1849, and has since then spread not only throughout the Lutheran Church but into many other denominations. By far the largest and most valuable Deaconess training plant in this country is the one at Philadelphia, given by the noble Pennsylvania German, John D. Lankenau, erected at a cost of half a million dollars, supported during his lifetime by its liberal founder, and sustained since his death by funds which he bequeathed. The deaconess work within the General Synod has been carried on, largely, also through the efforts of Pennsylvania Germans, among whom should be mentioned Drs. F. P. Manhart, Charles E. Hay and W. S. Freas. The Mother-House and Training School of the General Synod is located in Baltimore, and has property worth \$50,000. Other Deaconess institutions, founded by Dr. Passavant, were established at Milwaukee, Chicago and Jacksonville, Ill.

ARTICLE VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

BY REV. W. L. RUTHERFORD, A.M.

It is not our purpose to present a critical, theological thesis on the doctrine of sin, but it shall be our pleasure rather to take a more practical view with that scope and fulness possible under the laws of brevity. Dr. Sprecher in his treatise of the II. Art. of the Augsburg Confession declares the subject to be "the most important and difficult within the whole range of theological thought." We may not be theologically profound, therefore, but we trust we may be at least biblically clear in the discussion that shall follow.

I. THE ORIGIN OR SOURCE OF SIN.

The origin of sin as it relates to man is of a two-fold nature—external and internal. We have not only the evil forces from without, bent and determined on the ruination of the human soul, but there is a yielding within the soul, a surrender in the conflict that constitutes the sin and entails the ruin. If we will allow our thoughts to peer out beyond our Edenic history, as we turn on the search-light of the Scriptures, we have revealed the primal event in the fall of the angels which must stand as the origin and source of all evil. Although we are compelled to acknowledge the time and circumstances relative to the fall of the angels as a deep mystery, and the so-called "insoluble problem," yet their fall as an incontrovertible fact, and the source of sin and evil seem perfectly consonant and co-existent. How the angels in their high and holy estate should willingly choose to leave their exalted plane of holiness and assume the character of demons is rightly called the "mystery of iniquity." Nevertheless, the fact of the fall remains, and is fully established by the sacred Scriptures: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell." (2 Pet. 2:4). "And the angels which kept not their first es-

tate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness." (Jude 6). "And the great dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." It is in this Serpent, or the Devil, or Satan, or Beelzebub the chief of devils, who was not content in drawing angels into the fellowship of his crime, but sought in subtlety to overthrow and ruin the human family, that we find the external source of sin. Man's condition and character in his state of innocence, like those of the holy angels, were subject to the use or abuse of the power of choice or free agency. And when Satan, the Serpent, with his knowledge of supernatural things is joined with intense hatred and murmuring against God; and with his jealous, envious nature enraged against good angels and godly and happy men, man's possibility to fall is apparently rendered much easier than that of the angels, on account of the subtle force of temptation to sin brought to bear upon him from without. This has been intimated as the probable "reason why the mercy of God was pleased to intervene in redemption for him, while the fallen angels are left to ruin." *

Whilst it is true that the Word presents no direct and explicit doctrine on the origin of evil, there are three facts in evidence, suggested by Dr. Henry Van Dyke, that are unquestionable: *First*, that it is "that which ought not to be." *Second*, that "evil actually exists." *Third*, that "evil is contrary to that which ought to be." "That which ought to be," says the same author, "we acknowledge to be the will of God. And if this is true, then that which ought not to be, can only make itself known in the world through the will of a creature capable of going contrary to God. The possibility of evil, therefore, depends upon the liberty of the created will," and this naturally applies to both the fall of the angels and of man, since angels also possess mind, and are capable of thought, language and emotion, indicated in their utterances in the very language of men, their desires, rejoicing &c.

* Dr. Valentine, *Systematic Theol. Outlines*, p. 104.

Sin may be defined, therefore, as being primarily the abuse of the power of choice, and the power of contrary choice stands as the very door through which evil entered the world. Man fell, therefore, through an external solicitation. It was not purely from within as some may suppose who fail to comprehend the source of evil. Its origin is not traced to the inner forces of man's nature. God had said: "Of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." But the devil in his lying deceit declared to the woman, "ye shall not surely die." The inner process of tampering with evil thus began within the human soul, opening the way to caprice and even violence to reason. Eve lustfully looking upon the fruit saw that it was "good for food," "pleasant to the eyes," and "to be desired to make one wise," not knowing that in it was moral impotence, death and ruin. Thus, "when lust had conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

Satan's first effort was to fracture the certainty of Eve's mind as to God's specific command. So with apparently full reverence for God the old Serpent injects into the mind of Eve a doubt as to this command, made possible through tampering with evil which always brings with it a growing desire to indulge. Eve attempted to reply, but the reply was itself tainted with the doubt. The threat, "Ye shall surely die," she rendered by the words, "lest ye die." God's *verily* was to her only a *perhaps*, and the death penalty was a risk and not a certainty, the view held by many today who are living in ignorance and unbelief. Here was the first sin—not the overt act, not the defiance of God's authority, but the doubt as to a clearly revealed command of God, and a questioning hesitancy in the place of prompt obedience, all of which had its rise in the first thought of parleying with the tempter. As a result the conscience seemed to be motionless and benumbed with doubt. It did not feel Satan's defiance of God's Word, his denial of divine threatenings, or his pervasion of God's orderings. The subtle intrigue and power of the devil to deceive, coming as he did under his transformation as "an angel of light," readily

holds sway and dominant influence over the soul after the way opened by human volition, and the conscience thus fractured continues to weaken for the greater error and sin. Consequently, into the place which doubt had prepared, unbelief quietly entered, without a protest even from the conscience once so active in reflecting the will of God. Thus it is man's word against God's word. God lays down his law as our rule, but unbelief recognizes no law but nature, or man's will. God warns of death; unbelief says there is no death, but annihilation. But the death penalty fell upon Eve's soul at the moment of her unbelief, and was executed upon her body after having been driven from Eden; and so her knowledge of good and evil made her not a god, but a sinner, with all the attending consequences.

The fall of man is therefore an historical fact recorded in Gen. 3 : 1-19, and is also treated as historical in the New Testament. (Rom. 5 : 14; 1 Cor. 15 : 22; 1 Tim. 2 : 14). The sable stamp of death upon all creation as the mark of God's penalty for man's disobedience and sin bears testimony not only to the existence of sin, but also to

II. ITS UNIVERSALITY AND CERTAINTY.

The degrading and death-working power of sin is manifest in all grades of the human family, from the lowest order in the jungles of Africa to the highest type of civilization. It not only exists in the pew, but it finds its way to the pulpit among Christ's ambassadors, and at times in most shameful form. None are exempt. It is found raging in the most vile, and also lurks in the heart of the most holy; or there would be no need of all asking for daily forgiveness. Its universality is in evidence everywhere. Society is everywhere on the defensive in recognition of evil and out of desire for good. The warnings of philosophy bear testimony. Dr. Van Dyke has truly said that "Men have turned away from Rousseau's skin-deep philosophy of the 'original goodness and unlimited perfectibility' of human nature, to the profounder view of the Hebrew Prophets." And the same author rightly asserts that "modern litera-

ture is haunted by the persistent spectre of evil, which 'will not down,' " while in the leading poets we have veritable commentaries on Jeremiah's text, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." And the testimony of science "lays bare the workings of the selfish, sensual, egotistical impulses in the career of the race," and affirms the existence of the "fatal net of heredity which holds all men together in an entanglement of defects of nature and taints of blood." And greater still, the Scriptures abound with overwhelming testimony of man's fallen and corrupt nature, and the exceeding sinfulness of sin. This is affirmed and rightly set forth in the II. Article of our Confession, where it says: "Also they teach, that after Adam's fall, all men, begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin," etc. The Smalkald Articles (Part III., Art. I) also declare: "We must confess that sin originated from one man Adam, by whose disobedience all were made sinners and subject to death and the devil. This is called original and capital sin. This hereditary sin is so deep a corruption of nature that no reason can understand it, but it must be believed from the revelation of Scripture."

III. THE NATURE OF SIN.

Whilst the origin of sin may be somewhat shrouded in mystery, its universality and certainty are everywhere established, and its nature fully revealed. Nothing is so deceptive, so cruel, so unrelenting and destructive as sin. It contains the very elements of death and ruin. It is deceitful beyond description. It has many secret ways of insinuation. It is like Delilah, and like Jael to Sisera. It has been called a "sweet poison that tickles while it stabs." As Joab came with a kind salute to Abner, and thrust him under the fifth rib, while Abner thought of nothing but kindness, so sin comes smiling, pleasing, and humoring while it thrusts the deadly dart. It is exceedingly apprehending also in its nature. So both the awful results of sin and the Scriptures testify: "His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins." The nature of sin is such that the penalty will en-

force itself. It requires no divine interposition to bring this about. The ball has already been set rolling down the mountain-side. The poison itself works death. The experience of David so perfectly expressed in the 51st Psalm reveals the awful nature of sin when in those penitential lines he informs us how it defiles (v.s. 2-7), haunts (v. 3), makes sad (v. 8), brings condemnation (v. 9), drives us from God's presence (v. 11), grieves the Holy Spirit (v. 11), robs of joy (v. 12), destroys our testimony (v. 13-15), puts a stumbling block in the way of others (v. 14), closes our lips (v. 15), and brings punishment.

Sin is a gigantic reality when we consider its overwhelming presence, the greatness of its power and the subtlety of its operations. It holds time and eternity in its grasp. It never will and never can, from its very nature, exhaust itself. Its power ever impels onward to greater sinning and greater condemnation. And this is an eternal process. The great teacher, who spake with authority, and as never man spake, says of impenitent sinners, "Their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." It is therefore no act of kindness but a most desperate crime for any man to spread a cover over the pit. It is there in awful reality. When God's Word says, "The wicked shall be cast into hell and all nations that forget God," it is an awful state and attitude that will declare that this is not so, and that no one need entertain fears about being forever lost. Sin, whether it be original or actual, leads away from God, from divine restraints, gospel influences, and the Spirit's call; but it does not lead from God's notice, nor reach, nor power. It is the nature of sin to deprive the soul of its strength in God, and by robbing it of its daily food it is soon brought to ruin. It also abuses the soul by employing its noble powers in a way contrary to that for which they were intended. Consequently the soul is put to the hardest service, for "the way of transgressors is hard."

IV. THE EFFECTS OF SIN.

The effects of sin, which have been called "the symptoms

of its nature," have already been largely indicated in the disclosure of that nature. These effects and consequences are directly traceable to the inherent depravity which has taken the place of the holy disposition with which man was created. We are informed by such authority as Dr. Valentine and others, that "this original sin, or depravity, is *total*, but total only in a specific sense. It is not total in a sense that man is so depraved that he cannot be or grow worse. Nor that he has no better elements, such as natural conscience, perceptions of right, and sense of obligation in his nature. He has such powers, though obscured and impaired, on which God's grace may get hold and operate. Else there would be no capacity for the supernatural salvation in him. It is total, in the sense that *all* man's powers, intellect, sensibility and will have been injured by the disordering power of sin in the soul's nature. No faculty is unaffected by it." The whole nature is depraved in and by the depravity, "The heart, that is, the affectional nature, and dominating the will, the *whole* man is kept in bondage to evil." The whole nature, therefore, is in itself helplessly subject to this ruling depravity. The body felt the sin of the soul, and the result was pain, sickness and death; and life below man felt man's sin, for "the whole creation groaneth and travaleth in pain together until now." So from that primal note of discord with the divine will, struck in a single sinful act by our parents in Eden, there arises a mighty dirge of woe, uttered by every creature upon earth, the wail of sin stricken humanity, and of a sorrow-stricken world. Besides all the maladies of the body and its temporal death, there are still other effects or consequences of sin—the most prominent being the state of actual guilt placing all under condemnation, which if allowed to continue must terminate in spiritual death. It is as Dr. Valentine puts it: "A dissolution of the spiritual fellowship or union between man and his God—the deepest reality in the consequences of sin, and also eternal death, if no redemption comes."

Henry Van Dyke informs us that "there are four elements in a true sense of sin: shame, pain, fear and hope. The shame

comes from its ugliness, its defilement, and mocking of those elements in us which we fell belong to the divine image and our better nature. The pain proceeds from its enslaving and imprisoning power. Man was made for liberty. But sin is bondage to evil. And the fear ensues from the sense of disobedience to a high, mysterious, inexorable command." But in the presence of the awful nature and effects of sin, man constitutes a worshiping being, repentant, longing, hoping; and in the language of the poet: "Hope, like the cork to the net, keeps the soul from sinking in despair."

The provision for this inner longing and hope of the soul God has made in

V. THE REMEDY.

This was ordained before the foundation of the world, in the person of God's Son, whom he began to reveal in prophecy immediately after the fall when he declared that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. Two scarlet threads run through the entire scriptures—the blood-red thread of guilt, and the blood-red thread of redemption. It is a very singular and striking fact that blood is the sign of both sin and of redemption. The life-blood of the avenged has ever cried out against the sinful avenger. The blood of Abel cried out from the ground unto God in vengeance upon him who shed it, but Christ's blood cried for pardon. Looking heavenward in his agony upon the cross while his blood flowed for the sins of the world, he exclaimed, "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do." Christ's blood speaks better things than that of Abel. It speaks to God in behalf of sinners. It speaks not for vengeance, but for mercy, pardon and peace.

Redemption is the prominent, and in fact, the dominant idea of the whole Scriptures. The germ and spirit of the whole conception is deliverance from the power, penalty and bondage of sin. The great truth that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," is accompanied with the universally felt necessity for an atonement. And with this there is linked the universally felt necessity of the shedding of blood as an indis-

pensable means of atonement. In our holy religion this doctrine is set forth in the unmistakable language of Holy Writ: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." And, "Without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins." The shedding of blood for sin in the types foreshadowing the Anti-type, finds its fulfillment and culmination in the great sacrifice of Christ, offered once for all on calvary, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." It is through the grace of God that the soul hears his word, receives the call of the Spirit, and is thus led to the conviction of sin, repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

No doctrine in relation to sin is more clearly and fully taught than that of repentance. John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness cried, saying, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." When Christ was thrust from Nazareth, and found his way to Capernaum, "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Upon another occasion he declares: Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish. As Peter stood at the beautiful temple gate delivering the sermon that resulted in the conversion of 5,000, he exclaimed. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Hence repentance holds a vital relation to the divine call and illumination through the word and Spirit.

If sin is to be overcome and Satan vanquished, it must be a genuine repentance that includes a saving faith. It dare not be merely a carnal repentance, caused by fear of punishment, as in the case of Cain, the murderer, who deplored the fact that he must be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth. Neither will a transient repentance which subsides with the judgment, suffice; like that of Pharoah who soon paid the penalty with all his host at the bottom of the sea. A superficial repentance will not answer, which retains the sin, like that of Pilate, who in vain pretension washes his hands in innocence and remains guilty of the blood of Jesus. Nor is it a despairing repentance which ends in death, like that of Judas, who having betrayed

innocent blood in his bitter remorse, suicides, and is called the "son of perdition." Neither dare we confound it with a morbid self accusation, which is the fruit of dyspepsia, or melancholy or insanity. Nor is it that dread of hell, and sense of wrath, which might occur even to devils, for they also believe and tremble. Genuine repentance is that hatred of evil, with a sense of shame, and a longing to avoid sin, with a hearty sorrow for wrong doing, wrought by a sense of divine love, that wings the soul on its way by faith to Christ. As Dr. Valentine puts it, which is in strict accord with our confession, "The term expresses the whole inner conscious exercise of the soul under grace, convinced of sin, turning from it, and resting on forgiving love. Repentance, therefore, is made up of two elements, *contrition*, which leads the soul to abhor sin and flee from it, and *faith* which leads to Christ, to accept him in love and appropriate his righteousness. It is the positive element of *faith*, which is the gift of God, that becomes the instrument of our salvation." "For by grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." By faith we are regenerated, justified, receive the adoption to sonship, and become sanctified, enjoying a glorious restoration through the efficacy and power of Christ's blood.

Our deliverance from sin is complete in the great and perfect sacrifice of Christ. We are not only rescued from the consequences of sin, but from sin itself. We are delivered from its penalty, its power, and its presence. We are saved from the *natural* penalty of self-inflicting injury to our whole being, and the judicial penalty of impending doom under the wrath of God in his justice, were there no salvation. If the power were not broken, the abolition of the penalty would but leave us to fall into new sin, and new condemnation, like a discharged prisoner who is ruled by his depraved passions. But the power of sin is broken in the new life of the believer, by daily mortifying the flesh with the affections and lusts, and by daily vivifying the inner man by the Spirit of God. Whilst every new

step and stage of holy growth crowds sin more and more out of our being, we cannot be delivered from its presence in this life, but the final victory in Christ will be a complete deliverance from the very presence of evil. In heaven nothing enters "that defileth, or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie." But with "our robes washed in the blood of the Lamb," and our "names written in the Book of life," we shall appear sinless in our home beyond, where all associations are pure and holy.

The little bee as it flits from flower to flower amid the beauties of nature, is invested with a wonderful power of instinct that enables it to separate the nectar from the poison. If such is the power of one of God's creatures, classed among the insects, what shall we say of the discriminating power of the human soul, made in the image and likeness of its Creator—the power of choice in his free moral agency?

As the atmosphere, redolent with sweet perfumes of flowers, draws the bee to sweet draughts of nectar, so the Holy Spirit constrains and draws the soul to the source of all that is "sweeter than honey and the honey comb." The life of the bee is to live among the flowers and draw from them the sweets, but if the bee has lost its power to find the flower it is virtually dead, because cut off from the great source of comfort and maintenance of life.

Having lost our natural and true relation with God we become "dead in trespasses and sins," cut off from the sweets of his kingdom; but by the gift of faith in Jesus Christ through the Spirit, we have restored that power of communing with God, which enables us, to our perfect satisfaction, to draw our sweetest blessings from the "Plant of Renown," "The Rose of Sharon," the "Lily of the Valley," and live in the kingdom of God's glory.

"Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

"And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

ARTICLE VIII.

PHILOSOPHICAL INFLUENCES IN HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT, A.M.

"I have devoured the Bible with a *fame canina* and read daily in it. It was my element and aliment. Just as much in love with Luther's translation as dissatisfied with the conceits of the disgusting and stupid meditations of the tasteless readers of holy books. These two contradicories, which, in spite of their divergence, come, as you are fond of saying, from one point, and in their results likewise reunite, your old Hamann at that time tried to overcome, and it grieved me, that a book was open for people who could not read, and for those who could read remained closed."*

To read the Bible without critical apparatus, without learned commentaries, without lengthy introductions, has become almost a lost art, if not, to a student at least, an impossibility. And the critical apparatus, the learned commentaries, the lengthy introductions have become so burdensome and so confusing that the student, unless he be a student of critical turn of mind, is frightened off, and he who is critically inclined is tempted to get no farther than the helps. For the old spiritual influence of the Word of God as a means of Grace there seems little room left, so that we can readily understand Hamann's inward annoyance. It is still the best advice that can be given to the student, even the student of theology, that he throw aside the commentaries, and read the Bible in a received text or a good translation. In the times of Rationalism the Bible so led men back to the Church; the Bible so read was the strength of the common people; the Bible so read postponed the evils of Rationalism and made possible the new-birth of churchliness in the nineteenth century.

If we ask, What has made such a direct reading of the Bible almost impossible, the answer will be very simple: the growth

* Hamann to Herder, April 9, 1769.

and popularisation of Higher Criticism, connected with philosophic, scientific and material developments within the last century. Material advance in inventions and control of nature's forces have made life more comfortable and the sense of higher needs less keen; scientific theories of man and of the universe have thrown doubts about the higher nature of man and the deeper meaning of life; philosophic speculation, adopting scientific methods, has still further reduced man to a natural phenomenon and the universe to a material unity in which the existence of the soul and the reality of a future life are lost. Yet all these influences might have been transitory and need not have affected the life of the Church, had not doubts and scientific explanations of the Bible been added to them. The proof may possibly be seen in the fact that men thoroughly modern and acquainted with the literary and material products of modern science and philosophy have been able to combat the results of Higher Criticism and to fight for the old Bible in its simplicity.

The Higher Criticism, however, claims to be only a necessary form of investigation, leading to higher and better and surer results, which shall be of great benefit to all people. It claims to be not so much Higher Criticism as Biblical Criticism, literary and historical criticism of the Bible. Its advocates regret the difficulties connected with it and the baneful effects upon the religious life of the people. "A sober-minded scholar cannot think without pain of the many devout souls who cry out—when criticism shatters some old statement or view—'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.' " (Nash, *History of Higher Criticism*, p. 7). The opponents of one set of results of the Higher Criticism as a method, by the same method reach other results, scarce taking time to ask whether the method may be false or not. Others, seeing the uncertainty of the results, seek other solutions, partly at least in the return to the older conception of the Bible, not as literature, but as the Word of God.*

* Cf. Kaehler, *Dogmatische Zeitschriften*, 1907.

The last method the writer considers the easiest and safest solution, the reasons for which view may appear later. But the Higher Criticism is a fact which must be reckoned with. If the details lead us only into greater confusion, it would seem natural to go back of details to a discussion of fundamental principles. Is the method of investigation known as Higher Criticism essentially valid, or is it so influenced and warped by contemporary thought as to be unreliable? Is it a pure criticism, or a criticism biased, even in its methods, by scientific and philosophic assumptions?

It might seem impossible so to regard Higher Criticism as a method. Of course individual critics have been much biased by their philosophy; but on the other hand, the method has been only a tool misused in their hands, and they have been refuted by others using the same method. To doubt the method is to unsettle the positive no less than the negative results of criticism. And to imply that the method is philosophically or scientifically biased, would imply that the positive, conservative critics are under such philosophic or scientific influence.

It may be well to remember how subtle are the influences of the *Zeitgeist*, and how difficult it is for any scholar to keep himself free from them. Then also that many of the works of reference and fundamental works, lexicous and grammars, are the productions of advanced critics, and how subtle the influence of their theories is in their works. It may be interesting to recall the words of A. S. Farrer with reference to an earlier movement in German theology: "Its original connection with the deist and ethical points of view, and the constant sense of living in an atmosphere of controversy, have impressed even some of the more orthodox writers with a few peculiarities, of which a student ought to be made aware: for example, with a slight tendency to a kind of Christian pantheism; a disposition to reduce miracle to a minimum; and in the department of Christian doctrine to consider Christ's life as more important than his death, and to regard the atonement as an effect of the

incarnation, instead of the incarnation being the means of the atonement."*

An unconscious influence borrowed from the opponent is therefore neither an impossibility nor an improbability.

The term Higher Criticism has been repudiated by the advocates of the method. Nash holds that "the word 'Higher' answers no present need. It makes neither for clearness nor precision."† Heinrici points out the difficulties of the term and of the distinction especially between a higher and a lower criticism. (PRE 11 : 126). Zenos, however, defends it as a convenient although arbitrary term, since no other term covers quite the same ground.

The term is traced to Eichhorn, who refers for earlier usage to the classical scholars. Unfortunately I have been unable to find the earlier usage, nor does any writer so far as I know trace the term beyond Eichhorn. Eichhorn used it in 1783 perhaps not uninfluenced by the Zeitgeist. An interesting note in Eucken, *Geistige Strömungen der Gegenwart* is at least very suggestive: "'Höher' ist als Lieblingsausdruck für eine neue, vermeintlich vornehmere Denkweise wohl namentlich in der Sturm und Drangzeit der deutschen Litteratur aufgekommen. Dann suchte mit besonderer Vorliebe die Romantik dadurch die eigenen Ziele und Begriffe von denen des Durchschnitts abzuheben; so verwendet auch Schleiermacher in seinen Jugendschriften das Wort sehr oft. Man spricht von 'höherem' Leben, 'höheren' Gefühlen, 'hoherer' Bildung, 'höherer' Sittlichkeit, u. s. w., bis der Ausdruck dem Spott verfällt ('höherer Blödsinn'). Der soliden und klaren Denkweise Kant's widersetzte der Ausdruck gründlich. Als Feder ihm einen 'höheren' Idealismus zugeschrieben hatte, bemerkte er dagegen (IV. 121. Hart * *): 'Bei Leibe nicht die höhere. Hohe Turme und die ihnen ähnlichen metaphysisch-grossen Männer, um welche gemeiniglich viel Wind ist, sind nicht für mich? Mein Platz ist das fruchtbare Bathos der Erfahrung.' " (p. 76)

* History of Free Thought, p. 288.

† P. 13.

‡ *Elements of the Higher Criticism*, Chap. I.

Does the term alone bear traces of such influence, or can they be found also in the method? A few hints rather than detailed discussion may here be attempted.

Higher Criticism is a kind of cross-examination of documents, and cross-examination is the art of asking questions. The questions are determined only in small part by the data, in large part by the theory of the questioner. A critical history of cross-examination might show that the influence of contemporary theories of psychology is very marked in the form and order of questions. If it is correct that Higher Criticism belongs into the same class with cross examination, a similar influence is to be expected.

There is however one important difference: cross-examination deals with men, Higher Criticism of documents with the fixed utterances of men. The witness gives his own answer, even if it is given a peculiar meaning by the formulation of the question. The Higher Critic reads his answer himself, and hence his theory will be doubly important, affecting both question and answer.

The method of Higher Criticism is to be scientific, and therein lies a fundamental influence noticeable throughout its history. Scientific method as ordinarily understood has been developed in the study of data in the material world. It has grown upon the assumption of the uniformity of nature, and therefore of the possibility of reducing all data to laws. It is the method of natural science—a method of approximation by analysis; a method of experimentation by varying the data and building new theories, to be tested by new analysis and experimentation; a method of observation, noting and studying with microscope and micrometer—for if the universe is uniform, the smallest datum is the most easily observed and most likely to give a clue to secrets not dreamed of in the larger.

A glance into a work of Higher Criticism may suffice to reveal these borrowed principles of scientific method. Word-forms, constructions, sentences and thoughts are analysed to the last detail, and he is the keenest critic who has discovered the finest point. The possible constructions are compared and

by experiment the possibilities increased. A date or an advent is assumed, to see what light it may throw on the problems, and its existence made probable by the success of the solution by its aid. When the general usage of a writer has been noted, the particular instance is made to harmonize with it, on the assumption that the man like the universe is self-consistent and his usage harmonizes throughout. The probability of a reading or a rendering is determined by the frequency of its use, according to the law of probability. In short the method of Higher Criticism becomes mechanical, because the psychology of the day is mechanical.

The expression of thought in words is tacitly assumed to be a natural phenomenon, the laws of whose being can be as accurately determined and as infallibly applied as the laws of any natural phenomenon, and by the same method. Nor are these laws always determined solely from the documents; frequently they are inherent in the ideals of the critic, he transfers his conception of the laws which govern the production of a word to the author, and assumes that the author must consciously or unconsciously have followed these laws. In all which one thing seems to be generally overlooked: the expression of thought, whether natural product or not, is only an approximate expression at best; too close scrutiny will not give the meaning intended, but something far different. If we note carefully the process of writing we can hardly help realizing that although we do follow unconscious laws in expressing our thoughts, these laws do not prevent us from inconsistencies and imperfections of language and of thought. When we further remember that the writings gathered in our bible were largely written by plain men, very few of whom were literary by training, and were written for plain men without appreciation for literary niceties; and that a plain man naturally takes the most simple and direct meaning of a sentence, it seems plain that a mechanical system of study will not give us the meaning intended, and that too close scrutiny of details will warp it; unless we are willing to assume that these writers,

guided by the Holy Spirit wrote far better than they knew, which is decidedly not the assumption of Higher Criticism.

Higher Criticism as a scientific method has been influenced by a mechanical science and psychology. Connected with this influence is the tendency to judge a phenomenon by its origins. As science judges man by his origin in a series of natural phenomena, so Higher Criticism judges or tends to judge Christianity by its origin. As man is an animal, so Christianity is a system of thought. If man can be shown that this system of thought has affinities with earlier systems, its nature must be like theirs, just as in science because man has certain affinities with lower animals he cannot be inherently different from them. Hence the striving of the critics on the one side to prove such affinities, on the other to show their insufficiency. The fundamental error on both sides is overlooked: the scientific habit of judging the tree by the seed from which it grew rather than from the fruit which it bears; studying the cell rather than the man developed from it.*

Rudolf Eucken (*Die Einheit des Geisteslebens*, 1888) distinguishes two and only two modern *Lebenssystemen*—a term somewhat wider than philosophy of life: that of Naturalism and that of Intellectualism. The influence upon Higher Criticism noted above belong rather to the former of these. A second series of influences is due to Intellectualism, or the belief that all existence can be and must be reducible to a system of thought, or can and must be a rational unity. Hence arises monism, a form of philosophy not based upon material data, but forced upon them by the intellect. It seems a survival in modified form of the Rationalism of the eighteenth century. Rationalism believed it possible to construct the universe by

* Since the above was written, I have found the following in a review of Foster's *Finality of the Christian Religion*, in the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, Dec. '06, by G. Ferries: "We are led up to the modern principle—and it is one which the author strenuously advocates in other connections as well—that a product like the Bible is to be judged 'by its fruits, not by its roots.' 'Things are what they are, and not what they came from.' "

reasoning, much as science later believed it possible from a mud-fish to deduce all animal forms. Intellectualism has recognized the material facts, but believes that these must be intelligible to the mind of man, that the mind of man is the measure of the universe. To understand is its highest attainment. Of soul and personal faith it knows nothing. To all intents and purposes soul is mind; the person is thought; religion becomes a form of thought, man's thought concerning God.

It may be questioned whether naturalism is not a form of Intellectualism or a result of it, and whether the influences of both upon Higher Criticism may not be treated as due to Rationalism. The unity of nature, the unchangeableness of nature's laws, are after all postulates of Intellectualism. If the highest attainment of man is to understand the universe, he must be able to understand it upon the basis of his own experience; in other words the existing laws which he infers from his experience must be the original laws of the universe; the universe cannot have undergone any radical change. Nor dare the universe anywhere include parts which are not subject to these laws. If these laws are conceived of as mechanical we have Naturalism; if as intellectual we have Intellectualism in the stricter sense.

But the fundamental assumption is unsatisfactory. Man is more than body, but also more than mind, and more than body, plus mind. Were Naturalism true the highest type of man would be one of most mechanical force; were Intellectualism true, the highest type of man would be one of most intellectual force; as it is, the highest type of man is a personal, spiritual force; he may be of but moderate physical strength and of ordinary intelligence, or he may be lacking in both to a large degree and yet be manly. Our speech thus recognizes something higher than learning or understanding as the essence of man.

But if the intellect is not the sole arbiter of all things, what becomes of its postulates? What becomes of its demands that all existence reality must be one consistent harmonious unalterable whole in its vision? What of its insistence that all

things must be understood, and accepted only in so far as understood?

Higher Criticism tries to understand the writings included in our Bible, and to understand them as natural products of mind. This matter of understanding is to it all important. Kaehler has pointed out that the Church, following Jesus Himself, has laid little or no emphasis upon this understanding; that the understanding the Scriptures of which Jesus speaks is something entirely different. It has no such direct reference to the intellect.* The conclusion is inevitable, that Higher Criticism has been influenced throughout by the intellectualistic philosophy of the time. The fact is recognized by Heinrici when he writes: "The development of Biblical Criticism is determined by this antithesis (of reason and revelation), which in

* "Jesus und seine Boten waren weder darauf vorbereitet noch auch gerichtet, ihre Bibel als Quelle für die Volks-, und Religionsgeschichte Israels zu durchforschen; vielmehr lesen sic aus ihr die Offenbarung Gottes, des Vaters Jesu Christi. Deshalb legen sie die Schrift auch nicht von dem Standpunkte der Verfasser ihrer Teile (zeitgeschichtlich) aus, sondern im Lichte der von Gott gegebenen Erfüllung. Sie ist eben ihre, des Measias und der Messiasgläubigen, Bibel, und vom Evangelium aus schätzen, beurteilen, verstehen und behandeln die apostolischen Männer den Inhalt ihrer Bibel. Kraft des von Gott gesetzten grossen, geschichtlichen Verhältnisses ist diese *nicht zeit*—geschichtliche Behandlung berechtigt und nicht ungeschichtlich." (*Zeitfragen*, p. 112). "Man vergesse doch nie, dass der Unglaube unser aller Anfechtung ist. Er nimmt leicht die Form ernster Erforschung der Sachlage an. Immer kommt aus ihm Wunsch und Streben, sich der Aufgabe des Glaubens (Heb. 11, 1) zu entschlagen und Wissen an die Stelle zu setzen. Folgende Schlüsse sind dieser imgrunde immer gleichen Art: Die Tatsache der Auferstehung Jesu lässt sich zwingend geschichtlich beweisen; sie ist ein Wunder; das setzt Allmacht voraus, also einen Gott; deshalb kann die Gemeinde an sein Dasein glauben. * * * * Oder: die Bibel wirkt noch heut Wunder, denn sie gibt mir Anweisungen zur Gestaltung meines Lebens, also kann ich auch an die Offenbarung in Christo glauben. Das nennt man Erfahrungsglauben. Die Bibel nennt das vielmehr Gott versuchen. Man verwechsle nur bei dieser Beurteilung nicht die ausreichende Begründung des Glaubens mit seiner Bestätigung und Stärkung. Um 'die Fusspuren des lebendigen Gottes in unserm Leben' zu erkennen, muss man diesen Gott kennen und an ihn glauben." (*ibid.* 194 note).

the most diverse modifications permeates it without being able to come to a clear solution." *

Sir W. M. Ramsay (*Expositor*, Dec. 1906, 'Professor Harnack on Luke') looks forward to a new phase of criticism in the Twentieth Century, and finds an indication of its coming in Harnack's *Lukas der Arzt*. Perhaps we may point to the philosophy of Eucken and the "Zeitfragen" of Kaehler as probable contributions to the new criticism. The reign of intellectualism is of long standing, and may not easily be broken. It extends from Greek philosophy to scholasticism, broken for a time by the Reformation it grew strong in scholastic orthodoxy, rationalism, and nineteenth century intellectualism. Advocates of a more personal interpretation have never been wanting: the Mystics, the Pietists, the Bible Christians; among the ancients Socrates.†

Kant strove to break through intellectualism, but his followers have almost ignored his effort. "Auch einem Kant ist sein kategorischer Imperativ nicht das Erzeugnis seiner philosophierenden Vernunft, sondern die Autarität der Vernunft als der eigentlichen Personennatur gegenüber dem rebellischen empirischen Menschen." (Kaehler, *Zeitfragen*, 183.) Now Eucken contends for a "Lebenssystem der Personalwelt," perhaps not yet free from intellectualistic influences. Already religion is more fairly understood; the reaction upon criticism must follow. Kaehler is a good guide, although he seems unconscious of the influence of a new trend of thought. He is satisfied to be counted among the "Zurückgebliebenen," whereas it may be truer to regard him as a forerunner of the future criticism ‡

* P. RE. II, 142.

† Sokrates "gedachte, durch das Wissen auf das sittliche Leben zu wirken, aber hat nur die eine Hälfte seines Strebens erreicht, indem er von der Berrachtung des sittlichen Lebens aus auf das Wissen gewirkt hat." Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie alter Zeit*, II. Thiel, 2 Aufl. 1837, p. 44.

‡ "Allein Theologen sollten sich die Nüchternheit bewahren, die Proben von unsicherem Tasten der Altertumsforschung auf dem Gebiete des religiösen Lebens nicht als massgebende Ergebnisse der wissenschaft zu behandeln und zu verkünden; und auch die Selbständigkeit sollten sie besitzen, dass sie es ertragen können, eine Zeitlang als Zurückgeliebene bezeichnet zu werden. Wer warten kann, erlebt auch in der Wissenschaft Überraschende Umschwünge." (Ibid., p. 92f).

For the Church this change in criticism may seem of considerable interest and benefit. It must not be overestimated. A reformation based upon a philosophy will differ radically from the Reformation of the sixteenth century. After all it is an intellectual change, not a personal regeneration. In this sense Kaehler will remain among the "Zurückgebliebenen," but the "Zurückgebliebenen" will have more respect from the *Zeitgeist*, and perhaps more difficulty in holding their position against it.

When we thus consider the influences of philosophic thought upon criticism, it seems strange that the Church and its theologians have yielded so largely to the time-spirit. Yet in reality it is not strange. To free one's self from the time-spirit is almost impossible; and upon the assumptions of the time-spirit the case of the Church seemed desperate. Only the "Zurückgebliebenen" could remain faithful to it and argue for it; but they were not understood, even when they fought with the enemy's weapons; they were of a different spirit. Hence the practical hopelessness of opposing higher critical results by means of higher critical methods: hence the failure of Orr's Old Testament Criticism, in spite of its learning and keenness. Hence the wisdom of Kaehler's determination not to write on a subject where at best the most secure results are based upon assumptions and data temporarily acknowledged and accessible.*

* *Zeitfragen*, p. 14f.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ROBERTS-MANCHESTER PUBLISHING CO., MILWAUKEE.

The Ideas that have Influenced Civilization in the Original Documents. Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph.D., Editor. Ten volumes. Large octavo.

It is our candid judgment that this is the most important and valuable work, the Bible excepted, that has issued from the press in America for many a day. The first sentence of the Preface sufficiently indicates the character and scope of the enterprise: "It is the purpose of this work to present the ideas that have influenced civilization in the words of the man or the documents that have developed them." The work contains what the editor believes to be the most important monographs and documents that have ever been written on religion, philosophy, the natural sciences, discoveries, inventions, law, government, education and "the great movements which have made manifest the pulse beat of the ages, as they have been caught and held living in the kinetograph-like records of the best contemporary observers." Every important subject is introduced with a brief historical sketch, and every great author with a short biography. Each volume contains numerous illustrations, which serve both to adorn the work and to shed light on the subjects discussed.

Volume I. is devoted to *The Ancient World*. Original treatises expounding and illustrating the religions and civilizations of Assyria, Egypt, and India, make up the contents of the volume. Volume II. embraces *The Greek World*. Here we have "Religion," "Institutions," "Early Greek Thinkers," "Plato," "Diogenes," "Aristotle," "Zeno," "Epicurus." One hundred and forty-seven pages acquaint us with the best thoughts of Plato in Jowett's translation. Aristotle speaks to us in seventy-two pages, also in Jowett's translation. Volume III. is devoted to *The Roman World*. More than half the volume is taken up with "Institutions." The remainder is occupied with the best philosophical and educational thought of the greatest Roman thinkers. Volume IV. is sub-titled *Early Mediaeval Age*. Here the chief subjects are "The Growth of the Church," "The New Peoples," "The Era of Arabs," "Feudalism." Volume V. discourses of "Renaissance

and Reformation Periods." Among other things we find in this volume Luther's Ninety-five Theses, Calvin's "Eternal Election," the Augsburg Confession, the Dutch Declaration of Independence, the most important principles of Bacon's Philosophy, Galileo's thoughts on astronomy and Kepler's "Laws." Volume VI. brings us to *Advance in Knowledge*. "Education," "Modern Philosophy," "Religious Movements," "Political Economy," are the chief subjects brought to our attention. Volume VII. discusses *The Era of Revolution*. "The Supremacy of Parliament," "The American Revolution," "The French Revolution," are embraced in the table of contents. Volume VIII—"1800-1833"—lays before us the most important speeches, decisions, state-papers and essays of that formative period in national government and in science. Volume IX.—"18-1860"—contains *inter alia* original articles on "Physics," "Education," "Evolution," "Physics and Chemistry." Volume X.—"1860-1903,"—presents "Social Movements," "Social Conditions," "Archaeology," "Biology," "Psychology," "Philology," "Chronological Index," "General Alphabetical and Analytical Index"—the last covering forty-four pages.

Thus by naming the chief subjects treated in this work we have sought to describe it, rather than to analyze and to criticize it. It is a cyclopedia of original discussions and documents on all the leading subjects of human thought and activity. From beginning to end it is objective, and is free from religious, theological, philosophical, sociological and political bias. Do you wish to know the views of the best thinkers on any of the great subjects that have interested thinking men, and that "have influenced civilization," and, we may add, that have made the world better and happier, here you will find them. Hence we must laud and magnify the work. Its use will help to do away with some of the superficial and second-hand work which has only too long and too far influenced teaching and writing in America. For the teacher, for the editorial writer, for the statesman, for general culture, the work is well nigh indispensable. It ought to be found in every public library. Its presence gives an inspiration to study and to learn.

J. W. RICHARD.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Entwürfe zu Katechesen über Luther's Kleinen Katechismus.

Von Geo. Mezger, Professor am Concordia Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo.

Zweite durchgesehene Auflage. Octavo, pp. 301.

This book both in plan and in purpose is designed for catechetical instruction, though elaborate in size and in contents. It could not be employed in the catechetical class, but may be studied by the catechist with great profit, though we should be very far from endorsing all that the book contains. We utterly reject the following about the third commandment: "*In the New Testament God has actually abolished this commandment from appointed festival days.* So teaches the passage Col. 2: 16, 17." It is exactly this kind of teaching that in Germany has turned Sunday into a "pleasure-day," and that has helped to make church attendance so sparse in the land of Luther. Men may talk and talk about "sanctifying Sunday by hearing the preaching of the word, and attending the administration of the sacraments." So long as they begin by declaring that the third commandment is utterly abolished they will see Sunday become what it has long been in Germany and what it is fast becoming in America. The third commandment can be kept in a purely legalistic way, and it can be kept in a purely Christian way as a day of rest, a day of thankfulness, a day of recruiting strength, a day for public worship. *Abusus non tollit usum.*

As a specimen of Missouri catholicity we quote the following, italics and all: "If we would abide in faith we must first of all be careful to keep the word of God, and that pure and uncorrupt. God's word is taught purely and uncorruptly only in the true visible Church fellowship, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church. If we would remain in the invisible Church, then we must with all diligence take care to belong to the true visible, to the Evangelical Lutheran Church, because she is exactly the Church of the pure word and confession." P. 180.

It remains only to say that this book again illustrates the superb work in printing and binding being done by the *Concordia Publishing House.*

J. W. RICHARD.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD, BURLINGTON, IOWA.

What Think Ye of Christ? By F. Bettex. Translated from the German by J. F. Krueger (1907). Pp. 102. Price, including postage, \$.55.

F. Bettex is too well known to need an introduction. His booklets, "Christianity and the Study of nature," "Law and Nature," "The Symbolism of Creation and Eternal Nature," "The Miracle," "The Bible the Word of God," "Doubt, etc., are of the same order as this the latest one "What Think Ye

of Christ?" Popular and edificational. We might imagine we are reading Apologetics or Christian Evidences. The author's endeavor everywhere is to make Christianity appear reasonable. He is a staunch supporter of orthodoxy, making no concession whatever to the critical school, though his own theology is sometimes overbearing and often uncritical. A passage like this: "The creator of heaven and earth labored for thirty years as a carpenter, bought wood, planed, glued, made window frames, took orders, considered prices, bought shoes and clothes with his earnings"—is uncritical to say the least. The overbearing spirit is felt in one like the following: "Only let me warn you of one thing, if, tired of many questions and answers, you finally open your Bible after all, do not allow so-called science and alleged free research to demonstrate to you that the words of the Bible have an entirely different significance from their actual wording (p. 33)." In spite of this the author has many interesting things to say when he endeavors to present to his readers "an unprejudiced picture of the circumstances and the feeling of His time, of the manner in which people judged in His days, drawn from the records of the very Gospels * * * ." The object of the book is to prove the divinity of Christ. It indulges quite freely in the use of Scriptural quotations. The author's exegesis is largely determined by the dogmatical factor, which often does injustice to the true sense of the texts on which he builds.

The translation is too literal. It abounds in awkward constructions, pays but little regard to euphony. Nor is it always idiomatic. Moreover, the sense is often marred by the punctuation that the author employs. His use of the comma is something desperate.

The press work is excellent.

J. O. EVJEN.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Between the Testaments or Interbiblical History. By David Gregg, D.D., LL.D., President of Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa. Pp. 124. Price 75c., net.

This book, written in a popular and interesting style, disposes of Interbiblical History in three chapters, or essays: (I) The Jews of the Dispersion During the Period between the Testaments; (II) The Jews of the Home-land During the Period Between the Testaments; (III) The Old Testament Apocrypha as the Book of the Period Between the Testaments. A work of this dimension cannot of course do justice to the

Jewish literature that originated in the four centuries between Malachi and Matthew. Nor does it attempt this. But one cannot help carrying away, from the rapid survey given us in its pages, the thought that the apocryphal literature, uncanonical though it be, was exerting a strong influence upon Jewish thought in the time of Christ, and that it has had some influence upon the literature of later times. We are told that Wesley got from the Apocrypha his inspiration for that hymn of his which the Church will never let die, *Jesus, Lover of My Soul*. From the Apocrypha came also the *Benedicite*, so highly honored in all the liturgies of Christendom; further, that splendid hymn of the Germans, *Now Thank We All Our God*; likewise St. Bernard's great Hymn, *Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee*. "Out of [this literature] have grown maxims, and proverbs, and pictures, and poems, and dramas, and oratorios and great hymns." Ruskin and Handel, Shakespeare and Milton, John Bunyan and George Eliot are mentioned as being indebted to it. Eph. 6: 13-17 is mentioned as being to some extent dependent on *Wisdom* 5: 18-20; and James 1: 19 on *Ecclesiasticus* 5: 11, etc. The English Bible Dr. Gregg claims, should not have dropped this literature, but retained it in a class by itself, as is the case in the Bibles used by other nations, though the course of the Greek and Roman Churches is not approved of when they advocate its canonicity.

Dr. Gregg gives a political history of the Jews in connection with the history of their literature, briefly discussing the origin of the synagogue, the Sanhedrim, the rise of the Hellenistic culture and language. He emphasizes the fact that no cruelty was intended with the policy of the deportors of the conquered people. The conquered were to be amalgamated with the nation of the conquerors. Often the lands to which they were deported were better than the land they left behind; and grander opportunities for a grander, broader life were opened to them. The second generation of the deported were often the nabobs of the land.

A pleasant feature about the book is the references to standard authors and their works, several of which are productions of the twentieth century. The accompanying criticisms are valuable.

To the professional student Dr. Gregg's book offers nothing new. But he too cannot read it without thanking the author. To the non-professional class it is instructive. Both classes will find it suggestive.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

A Church History for the Use of Schools and Colleges. By Nils Lövgren, Bishop of Vesteraas (Sweden); with a series of Biographies by August Edman, Adjunct: Translated by M. Wahlström and C. W. Foss. Pp. 358.

The current text-books in English on the subject of General Church History are few in number, as a rule dry and forbidding, mainly manuals for theological students. The reason for this is to be sought in the fact that Church History, as a part of the American college curriculum, has had but scant support in American traditions. It is a different matter in Europe. We know of no "gymnasium" or "middle school" in Germany and the Scandinavian countries where Church History does not receive careful attention, being considered a requisite of academic culture. As a consequence, these countries have a variety of excellent text-books on the subject. One of these is that of Bishop Lövgren, of Sweden. It has passed through eight editions in the original. We are grateful to the Board of the Augustana Book Concern for authorizing a translation, and we welcome the Book in its English dress as a valuable acquisition to our historical literature and a friend to our schools and colleges.

It gives about eighty pages to the Ancient Era, thirty-five to the Mediaeval, 140 to the Modern, exclusive of fifty pages to the religious denominations in America and Missions. "The work aims to serve both as a text-book and a reader, and hence it contains two distinct parts. The text part forms a complete whole by itself and is printed in larger type. The second part forms a series of related topics and is printed in smaller type. It has several illustrations, presenting specimens of church architecture, official vestments, garbs of different orders, and pictures of celebrated men."

The book may be used in advanced parochial schools as well as in colleges. Even in the home and in catechetical classes it will be of good service.

While the Lutheran colleges in the West have been teaching Church History for more than a generation, those in the East have been singularly backward in this branch as an undergraduate study. An interesting work like Lövgren's ought not to be overlooked.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

BOSTON: HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO.

The Atlantic Monthly for July contains a number of valuable articles which are sure to attract the attention of such readers

as care only for the best literature. To this number Samuel P. Orth contributes a paper on "Government by Impulse;" Henry S. Prechtett, one on "The Power that Makes for Peace;" Charles M. Harvey writes on "The Dime Novel in American Life;" David Spencer contributes a valuable paper on "School Reform in Boston" and Isabel Moore one on "The Unknown Portugal." The two very readable serials which have created wide-spread interest, "The Helpmate" and "The Spirit of Old West Point" are continued. Those who are reading these surely consider them worth more than the price of the magazine. The contributors' Club contains, as it always does, spicy papers, and the poems in this number have decided merit.

EATON AND MAINS, 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

God's Missionary Plan for the World. By Bishop J. W. Bashford.

This volume is not as ponderous as its title might lead one to suspect. It is a very modest little book, written under the pressure of many exacting duties, while the mind was at white heat and under the mastery of the great truth, namely, that God's Book is a missionary book. Only a person of large qualifications could produce a strong vigorous book under such circumstances.

The captions of the nine brief chapters into which the book is divided, running thus, The Divine Purpose, the Divine Order of Procedure, The Old Testament and Missions, the New Testament and Missions, The Divine Method of Securing Power, The Divine Method of Securing Workers, the Divine Method of Securing Means, and the Divine Providence and Missions, indicate the several aspects of the general theme which the author presents, while the recurrence of the same term in each of them suggests his point of view, and where he desires the emphasis to fall. He is not pleading in behalf of a human undertaking. The world's evangelization, and then its Christianization, through the proclamation of the gospel, expresses the purpose of God. The evidence of this purpose is woven into the texture of Old Testament and of the New. Men are indeed the agents for the realization of this purpose, but they are left to their own devices. The whole inspiring, far-reaching campaign for the conquest of the world, together with all the chief factors necessary for its triumphant achievement, are clearly revealed.

The strength of the book lies primarily in the correctness of its point of approach. It is Biblical. The discussion is marked

by freshness, clearness and skill. Bishop Bashford is a man of recognized ability, of wide and varied culture, and withal a man of affairs. All these qualities have left their impress on his book. Underlying principles are clearly apprehended, and practical suggestions are not wanting. The author had Methodism in his eye as he wrote, but none the less his book will be helpful to Christians of every denominational name. We welcome it as a distinct contribution to the already voluminous and rapidly increasing literature of missions, and trust it may have a wide circulation.

L. KUHLMAN.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Psychology of Religious Belief. By James Bissett Pratt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Williams College, 1907. Pp. 327.

The author tells us, "the aim of the present work is to help break ground in the rich but rather neglected but important field of the investigation of religious belief from the psychological point of view." The "ground breaking" is not offered in apology; the reader may, however, incline to leniency of judgment because of it. Our space will permit only to call attention to the striking features of the book.

Part I, Psychological, contains two chapters; *The Elements of Psychic Life*; and *The Nature of Belief*. He warns us in the Preface that the reader must "worry" through Chapter one. The elements of the Chapter are good and we wish very much they had been stated with greater clearness.

Part II, Historical, consists of four Chapters. Here we have a resume of the history of the progress of belief which is admirable for its clearness and brevity, but fatally silent on points of primary importance. There is much truth in the strictures which he makes on the Christian apologists whose dogged persistence in holding to non-essential dogmas frequently prejudiced their own cause. "Fallacious argument cannot long support a belief."

The author passes the traditional arguments for Theism (with the notable exception of the Moral argument) in review and shows how Kant and Darwin have shattered them. He graciously grants that evolution has not refuted teleology "but since 1859 the design argument has suffered a very severe blow." With a significant twinkle he tells us how Diderot and Paley "shut their eyes" to the "fact of evil," and with clear evidence of mastery of Kant shows how the Antinomies

put an end to the ontological and cosmological arguments. But alas, the student so familiar with the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* does not seem to know that the author of that profound work has also written a *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*.

I cannot take the space to follow this character of argument which occurs all too frequently. The above example is typical.

We do not wonder, therefore, that he should come to conclusions such as these: "In short, the point I wish to make is that belief in God as an explanation of things * * * is dying." P. 192. "We are faced with this dilemma; the arguments which the people can grasp are no longer tenable, while the arguments that are tenable—if such there be—the people cannot grasp." "The battle of Armageddon has been fought—and lost." P. 194. These sentences occur in the concluding paragraphs of the Chapter "Of Christian Beliefs." The psychological processes by which the author's mind would reconcile these conclusions with his statement, page 231, "Of Belief in Mature Life," (Chapter based on results of a Questionnaire), "As a fact we find our friends and neighbors, of all degrees of education and intellectual ability, almost to a man accepting God as one of the best recognized realities of their world and as simply not to be questioned," we cannot even "worry" through.

We seek in vain for a reconciliation of the above incongruity in the Chapter "The Value of God." The nearest approach comes in the Conclusion where it is vague enough. It there becomes a matter of content of the concept expressing the *what* of belief, and a dogmatic definition by which the author would put his view into the meaning of the term for all other men.

In Chapter II, "On the Nature of Belief" the author bravely quotes Anaxagoras' famous saying: "Nor are the things that are in one universe divided or cut off from one another with a hatchet." One expects a belief, described thus as a unified total consciousness, to stand or fall as a unit. Spite of this he uses the "hatchet" and severs the universe of reason from the universe of feeling and finds the belief of reason untenable, the belief of feeling to be regarded with suspicion.

One solution is left: "The only kind of religious feeling which is really native to a cultured community is the calm and spontaneous type to which I have so often referred. Its normal condition is best expressed by a phrase that has lately come into common use: 'Religion as life.' It is best seen in the thousands of cheerful, wholesome, some times commonplace people, who, though very much like others in most respects,

meet their problems and look out upon their world in the light of an inner experience whose authority they never doubt." And this stands thus in genuine Nietzschean spirit as the platform from which the author pronounces sentence upon his "friends and neighbors who almost to a man accept God" saying, "belief in God is dying" because sooth Prof. Pratt, who is the standard, believes differently.

The author's concluding sentence is the "if" of the pronounced skeptic. All that *may* possibly be left is the Comtean or Nietzschean religion of humanity. "As the many dogmas of the Religion of thought follow the many dogmas of the Religion of Primitive Credulity into the museums and the history books—the ghost world of departed faiths—this one dogma, *if religion is really to last* (italics ours), will be seen in its true light as the one doctrine of the real *Religion of Humanity* (italics ours), because it is founded on the very life of the race."

If I have indulged too much in criticism it is because the author seems to me to have indulged too much in pessimistic pronunciamento and too studiously avoided a certain class of arguments which rightfully have a place beside those used. The author regards the logic of the most crass naturalistic evolution necessary. He justifies it by his method of exclusion. Here we radically differ.

The book impresses us as the effort of one struggling with skepticism who fails to resolve his difficulties. As a sketch of such struggle the book has psychologic interest

C. F. SANDERS.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES COMPANY.

1031 Walnut St. Philadelphia, Pa.

Light on the Old Testament from Babel. By Albert T. Clay, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Semitic Philosophy and Archaeology, and Assistant Curator of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania. 125 illustrations; 437 pages; \$2.00 net, postpaid.

Works on this and kindred topics are multiplying. Nor is this strange. The excavator is constantly busy, and every spade full of fresh earth contains something that throws light upon the Book. We are glad for this volume: it is packed full of intensely interesting facts. The author has no new hypothesis to propound, no theory reflecting the origin and composition of the Pentateuch to defend. He comes to his task unbiassed, free and ready to give the message which the

past has to deliver. He takes the discoveries that are being made and shows how they elucidate and corroborate the Bible. And, best of all, he has found nothing in all his searchings that contradicts the Bible, on the contrary the facts which he brings us out of the distant past are reassuring, and confirm and establish the sacred record.

The chapter on Babylonian Life in the Days of Abraham is exceedingly interesting and instructive. By it we are carried back to the days of the old patriarch; we look upon the things which he saw, and move among the scenes among which he moved. He is not a myth as the negative critics would have us believe, but a living reality.

There are just enough new ideas in this book to show us that our author can do his own, independent thinking. Among them we may mention his pushing the Exodus back to the time of Rameses II. while most writers place it in the reign of Merneptah, the son and successor of Rameses. So also in regard to the account of the mysterious writing at Belshazzar's feast. The chapter on the Comparison of Codes of Moses and Hammurabi is equally fresh and original. Dr. Clay also proves that the historicity of the Fourteenth of Genesis, about which radical criticism has made itself merry for a long time, is fully established by recent discoveries in Babylonia. "Two of the four kings taking part in the invasion mentioned in this chapter, Amraphel and Arioch, are now known through their own inscriptions. The father of Arioch, the King of Elam, informs us that he is suzerain of Palestine, which corroborates the statement in Genesis that the country served Elam for twelve years. All the arguments advanced to show that the chapter is unhistorical, in short, are without foundation."

We commend this work most heartily to all Bible students, it removes difficulties, clears up many obscure historical allusions and heeds to a stronger faith in the truthfulness of God's Word. It brings us the latest and best light on the Old Testament.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

